

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 770

UD 020 075

AUTHOR Ogbu, John U.
TITLE An Ecological Approach to the Study of School Effectiveness.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 90p.; Paper prepared for the School Organization and Effects Conference (National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., January 27-29, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); Black Education; Economic Factors; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Family Influence; *Family School Relationship; Labor Market; Learning; *Minority Groups; *School Role; *Social Influences; *Social Stratification

ABSTRACT

In this paper, the school is viewed as an institution used by members of society to help them to adapt to their environment. Examined are (1) relations between the school and other immediate settings, such as the home, preschool and day care programs, informal groups, children's extracurricular organizations and summer experiences; and (2) relations between the school and more remote settings, such as parents' working conditions and social life, neighborhood characteristics, inter-parental relations, and teachers' social lives, networks, and labor unions. In Part One, the "ecological framework" is outlined as it applies to the study of school effectiveness. Part Two addresses ecological factors influencing school effectiveness among stratified groups, arguing that racial and class stratification have different ecological consequences for learning processes and outcomes. This section focuses principally on educational problems of black Americans. In Part Three, the ecological analysis is extended to other American minorities and then to minorities in other societies. It is shown how similar ecological niches occupied by culturally diverse groups produce similar effects on their learning processes and outcomes. The final section of the paper suggests potential areas of research into the ecological factors influencing school effectiveness.

(Author/GC)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John U. Ogbu

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

(Draft-DO NOT QUOTE)

ED187770

AN ECOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

by

John U. Ogbu
Associate Professor
Department of Anthropology
University of California
Berkeley, California

Prepared for:
SCHOOL ORGANIZATION & EFFECTS
CONFERENCE
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C.

(January 27-29, 1978)

00020075

AN ECOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

by

John U. Ogbu

INTRODUCTION

My task in this paper was to develop a new approach to examining the influence of ecological factors on school effectiveness, partly on the basis of existing theory and research. More specifically, the ecological approach was to deal with how two sets of reciprocal relations affect school learning processes and outcomes. The first set of relations was to be that between the school and other settings within the school's immediate environment, such as the home, preschool and day care programs, informal play and peer groups, children's clubs and organizations outside the school, and camps and other summer experiences. The other set of relations was to be that between the school settings and more remote settings, such as the nature and conditions of parents' work, parental social life and social networks, characteristics and conditions of the school or family neighborhood, the extent and nature of relations among parents of children's peer groups, and social life and social networks of teachers, and the role of teachers' unions. Each set of relations was to be examined with respect to the degree and nature of the knowledge the parties in one setting had about the other setting, the social interconnections between the settings, the transitions from one setting to another, and the extent and content of communications and joint activities engaged in by persons in different settings. Finally, these sets of relations and their

effects on learning processes and outcomes were to be examined both as they now exist and as they have potential for change.

After a considerable search in the literature I found that many of the external settings, conditions, and events outside school had not been studied with regard for their reciprocal relations with the school. For example, I found only one study of a summer camp program which discussed public school organization, including teacher-pupil relationships and the curriculum; and this was the study of Crestwood Heights, an upper middle-class suburb near Toronto, Canada.¹ In other cases where the relations between the school and these external settings, conditions, and events had been specifically investigated, the results varied according to the populations served by the school. For example, studies of home-school relations in the ghetto and barrio produced different results from similar studies in middle-class suburban communities.² Where the relations among the external settings, conditions, and events themselves had been studied, the results also varied according to the populations involved.³ Given the nature of the work in this area, I've decided to develop a conceptual framework within which one could probe into the nature and consequences of some of the sets of relations listed here with regard to school effectiveness.

In addition to the sets of relations listed above, an adequate conceptual framework for studying ecological factors affecting school effectiveness must consider two other factors. The first has to do with the issue of the purpose of formal education or schooling in a contemporary technological society like the United States. This is an important factor when we are dealing with school effectiveness among lower-class and

ethnic- and racial-minority children and when trying to understand why and how different groups (parents, teachers, etc.) perceive and respond to schooling as they do. I do not agree with those social scientists who suggest that people ought to pursue education or school learning for its own sake and who say that lower-class and ethnic/racial-minority children are not able to perform like middle-class children because they are anti-intellectual and attend school merely to qualify for jobs.⁴ My own observations of Americans, discussions with many of them, and my reading of relevant studies, policy proposals, and project reports have led me to conclude that members of all segments of American society, including social scientists themselves, view education as a means to various ends, especially as a means to desirable social and occupational roles in post-school world. I will return to this subject later. School effectiveness, must, therefore, be discussed in terms of how well the school equips the children of any given segment of society with the kinds of knowledge, skills, and values required by their potential positions in adult life. In order to appreciate the full meaning of the last statement and to understand the scope of change necessary, we must distinguish between how things are in real life from how we want them to be. As I will make clear later, on the basis of the actual operation of the social and economic system, the white middle-class type of school success is not the only measure of school effectiveness. There may be, in fact, situations in which the school can be judged more effective when the children do not perform like white middle-class children. School effectiveness as a useful concept for research needs to be defined in relation to actual functioning of schooling for a specific population in a given time and place.

The other factor to be considered is the meaning of the term "ecological factors" (and by implication, "environment"). The external settings, conditions, and events listed in my assignment are not the only or even the major ecological factors influencing school effectiveness in American society. Too much emphasis seems to be placed on the social dimension of the environment, especially on the micro-social dimension (e.g., the home, the neighborhood, peer groups, and the like), with almost no reference made to the broader features of society or the macro-environment, such as the operation of the social, economic, and political systems, the stratification by social class and by race, and the like, which shape the settings, conditions, and events assumed to influence school effectiveness. These broader ecological factors also have a direct bearing on the organizational features of the school and, thus, on school learning processes and outcomes. I believe that if we are going to develop a useful ecological approach to the study of school effectiveness, we must define the environment more broadly than has traditionally been done in the study of educational problems in American society.

The foregoing considerations have led me to reformulate my task in the following manner. Instead of viewing the school as something out there in ~~the~~ social environment and asking how a set of ecological factors (i.e., reciprocal relations with some micro-social settings, conditions, and events) affect its ability to educate its pupils, I want to view the school as an institution used by members of society to help them adapt to their environment. The latter approach permits me (or some other investigator) to decide which of the external settings, conditions, and events are

also used by all or some members of society to meet the adaptive requirements of their environment; it allows me to consider the extent to which these function complementarily with the school or in the opposite direction, and to consider the reciprocal relationship between the school and these events and settings. It also permits me to study the problem of school effectiveness in regard to the adaptive needs of a specific group or population in a complex and plural society.

The rest of the paper is divided into four parts. In the first part I will outline my conceptual framework, the ecological framework, for the study of school effectiveness. In this section I will attempt to show that, among other things, the school is an institution through which members of a modern industrial society like the United States adapt to their technoeconomic, social, and political order. I shall do so by pointing out the linkages between schooling on the one hand and the types of personal qualities or competencies required for normal social, economic, and political roles in adult life; ^{on the other} how the required competencies affect the organizational features of the school; and how the linkages between schooling and roles in adult life as perceived by members of various groups affect their folk beliefs about schooling. I shall argue that all three of these types of linkages affect the processes and outcomes of school learning. The second section of the paper will deal with the ecological factors influencing school effectiveness among stratified groups in contemporary societies. I shall be particularly concerned with racially stratified groups, namely, blacks and whites, in the United States. I shall argue that racial stratification and class stratification have different ecological consequences for learning processes and outcomes. I will also distinguish between those minorities that do well in school and those that do not. Then, I will focus on black Americans for a number of reasons: a good many of the study,

discussion, and policy questions about school effectiveness have to do with black school failure; there is a good deal of confusion about the reasons blacks are not doing well in school which I hope the ecological approach will help to clarify; and my own research of nearly ten years has dealt mostly with questions regarding black schooling in the United States. In the third section of the paper I shall extend my ecological analysis to other American minorities, including American Indians, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans, and then to similar minorities in other societies. My purpose here is to show how similar ecological niches occupied by these culturally diverse minorities produce similar effects on their learning processes and outcomes. The final section of the paper will suggest, on the basis of the discussion in the other sections, potential areas of research into the ecological factors influencing school effectiveness, using the conceptual framework developed here.

Part One. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

1. Ecology and Adaptation:

From an anthropological perspective, ecology refers to the study of the holistic, reciprocal relationship between man and his physical environment or habitat. Expressed in another way, ecology refers to man's adaptation to his habitat.⁶ The role played by a population or its adaptation in this mutual, interdependent relationship is the "niche" it occupies in the habitat. A given habitat may contain many niches, making for the coexistence within the habitat of a number of populations or groups with differing adaptation needs.

The means by which a population adapts to its habitat is culture. A population both maintains and frequently modifies its adaptation by means of culture. Anthropologists are by no means unanimous, but the dominant view is that it is the technological and economic dimension (henceforth referred to as the technoeconomic dimension) of culture which is the chief means of man's adaptation to his habitat. Whether or not one accepts the view that in the evolution of modern societies the technoeconomic dimension is more important than the social and ideological dimensions of culture, there can be no doubt that every successive stage of technoeconomic development has greatly altered man's adaptation to his habitat. Furthermore, every technoeconomic advance seems to have greatly increased man's dependence upon technology for his adaptation to the habitat. In modern industrial societies, the technoeconomic dimension of culture has largely displaced the physical environment as the habitat to which man must adapt. It has also resulted in the development of complex forms of social and political organizations and relations.

11. The Role of Education:

Education has always played a crucial role in man's adaptation to his habitat because it is through the educational aspect of culture that children learn those skills, knowledge, values, and strategies which are essential for successful adaptation.⁷ In very relatively stable society there is a close relationship between the knowledge, skills, values, or other attributes required of normal adult members by their various social, economic, and political roles and the knowledge, values, and skills transmitted to children by the educational system. In other words, the processes and

outcomes of education depends to a large extent on what society demands of its adult members.

In my earlier research on education in Stockton, California, I emphasized the importance of understanding people's belief systems or folk systems, in order to comprehend their relationship to the school and their schooling efforts.⁸ I have subsequently sought to clarify the nature of that relationship with the school which generates and maintains the folk system about schooling and how it also directly influences people's efforts in school. In this task, I have found the work of a small number of scholars in the field of socialization to be particularly useful.⁹ Implicit but sometimes explicit in their work is the idea that socialization is the preparation of the child for adult life as his or her society conceives it. The attributes, personal qualities, or competencies that the child acquires in the course of socialization (e.g., knowledge, cognitive and motivational skills, and values, attitudes, and beliefs) are basically those the society demands for performing typical social, economic, and political roles available to adult members of the society, and for achieving full integration into the society.¹⁰

Inkeles' concept of competence provides the most useful guide for studying the linkage between the processes and outcomes of socialization and the demands of roles in adult life. According to Inkeles, each society has its role repertoire which creates specific demands for competencies upon its adults, and it is the purpose and responsibility of the society's socialization agencies, such as the family and the school, to train children to acquire these competencies. The adaptive competencies vary from society to society, so that, for example, those demanded by a contemporary industrial

society like the United States are different from those demanded by a hunting and gathering society, and the processes of acquiring the competencies in the two types of societies are probably different also. In a stratified society, because the system of stratification usually imposes different specific demands on members of the stratified groups by allocating to them different social, economic, and political roles, processes and outcomes of socialization likewise vary.¹¹

In asking why different groups achieve differently in American schools, I have found the above model very useful. In modern industrial societies the school is the principal agency delegated by society to prepare children to acquire the competencies needed for their adult roles. It is, therefore, to be expected that the processes and outcomes of schooling are largely determined by the competencies needed in adult life.

A few scholars have pointed out that organizational features of the school (e.g., classroom organization, pupil-teacher relationship or authority structure, the curriculum, the grading system, peer groups of both pupils and teachers, and the counseling system) facilitate the development of the competencies or qualities required for adaptation in modern industrial societies.¹²

A related view often implicit in the work of these scholars is that the organizational features of the school are themselves largely determined by the nature of competencies demanded of adult members of the society. Rosalie Cohen has, for example, put forward some interesting hypotheses concerning the shifts in American industrial structure and changing trends in school organization, which is now tending toward service orientation.¹³ She argues

that the shift from the secondary to the tertiary phase of industry is resulting in changes in the types of competencies that the school is required to transmit to students. Historically, the primary stage of industry involved the finding and extracting of raw materials. The secondary phase of industry was chiefly concerned with the production and marketing of tangible items; it resulted in some unique organizational features of the economic system, including (1) high levels of differentiation, specialization, and interdependence of roles; (2) complex rhythms of task scheduling tied to controlled flows of goods, machinery, and personnel; and (3) an object-oriented cognitive system. Cohen argues that these features were reflected in the organizational features of the school, especially in classroom organization. The school was required to develop "human capital" in the form of highly specialized skills; the curricula were designed to impart differentiated knowledge; classroom organization encouraged differentiation, classification, and complex time scheduling. The school supported the object orientation of the cognitive system by the use of standardized tests of intelligence and achievement.

Then in the decade of the 1960s the American economy entered a third phase, characterized largely by the provision of services rather than the production of tangible goods. Service production and distribution, such as in the areas of education, health, the civil service and the like, are not characterized by fine degrees of differentiation and specialization; they do not require complex rhythms of task scheduling because "service agencies function optimally on a schedule of human needs and demands, however these are defined, [which] are subject to 'rushes' with large ^Mlibos;"¹⁴ cognitively, service industry requires an interpersonal orientation rather than an

object orientation. The shift to the service phase of industry is leading to some changes in the organizational features of the school. According to Cohen, the school is now being reorganized to increase the production of individuals with service-relevant skills, through appropriate classroom and curricula modifications. Classroom modifications "include programs explicitly designed to regroup children and teachers, curricula and study units, in an effort to reverse the trend toward differentiation, classification, and complex time scheduling."¹⁵ Specifically, these modifications include open classrooms, schools without walls, and the like. Cognitively, the school is beginning to emphasize "affective curricula" which are person-rather than object-oriented. Another Cohen hypothesis is that the formal style of conventional classroom organization, which resembled the secondary phase of industry, required and promoted formal or analytic thinking, whereas the informal style of open classrooms and similar alternative forms of classroom organization associated with the third phase of industry requires and promotes nonanalytic, "relational" or other-oriented thinking among the students.

This is an interesting and important hypothesis which calls for serious empirical research. Indeed, survey studies already indicate that alternative (i.e., alternative to the conventional) education, including "humanistic education," is widespread nationwide and at all levels of the educational system.¹⁶ What has not been systematically studied is the extent to which the reorganization of the classroom and the curriculum is associated with the shift toward a service-oriented economy with its demands for competencies in interpersonal relations. The point I wish to stress, however,

is that the work of Cohen and others reinforces my own theoretical position that there is a linkage between the requirements of the social, economic, and political roles in adult life and the processes and outcomes of schooling in contemporary societies which deserve serious research efforts.

There is a third issue to be examined in order to determine the full range of ecological factors influencing school effectiveness: this is the belief system of the members of a society about the relationship between schooling and their social, economic, and political roles in adult life. This belief or folk system provides a good guide to individuals' efforts in school and their relationship with the school, and it contributes significantly to the outcomes of their schooling. A people's belief system is developed out of their perceived and interpreted experiences of particular social events, as well as out of their life in general.¹⁷ For example, I find that the American folk belief about schooling is intimately related to how they perceive and interpret the relationship between educational credentials and adult occupational status. In American society, as I have stated elsewhere,¹⁸ "almost every occupation, but especially the more desirable ones in terms of financial remuneration and social prestige, requires specific types of credentials which are achieved in school." Americans have come to believe that these highly rewarding roles are desirable, that the educational requirements for their attainment are justified, and that one should work hard in school in order to obtain the credentials. The evidence that Americans are preoccupied with schooling for utilitarian rather than intellectual reasons shows up in a wide range of contexts, such as those enumerated by Berg.¹⁹ People in other contemporary societies also have the same pragmatic view of education.²⁰

However, in a stratified society like the United States there is "impaired access" to the valued social, economic, and political roles in society for members of subordinate groups and "unlimited access" to the same for members of the dominant groups.²¹ If valued roles are thus differentially allocated or stratified, it follows that the competencies demanded by society from adult members of the stratified groups will also vary. And since organizational features of the school are related to the competencies demanded by the roles of the different groups, it follows, too, that the organizational features of the school will vary from group to group. Furthermore, because groups in the stratified system have differential access to (and therefore differential experiences with) valued roles in society, they will probably develop different belief systems about schooling. Thus in studying the ecological factors affecting school effectiveness in a stratified society, one does not simply focus on the relationship between the school and a given group in the stratification system, nor is it sufficient or even meaningful to study the reciprocal relationship between the school and some features of the group's social life. I suggest that the ecological approach requires at least four levels of inquiry: the position of the group in the social, economic, and political organization of the society; the kinds of competencies required by group members' typical roles; the relationship between the organizational features of the school and the competencies required by the group's typical adult roles; and the group's folk beliefs about schooling and the relationship of these beliefs to their status as well as the consequences of these beliefs on their efforts in school.

Part Two. BLACK AMERICANS: RACIAL STRATIFICATION, ECOLOGICAL NICHE,
and SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

1. Definitional Distinctions

1. Racial Stratification vs. Race: The ecological niche that black Americans occupy is determined primarily by a system of racial stratification. The role of racial stratification in determining black school performance has, however, not generally been recognized. In fact, the concept of racial stratification is not found in the index of any of the major works dealing with racial differences in school performance.²² Social scientists seem to recognize "race" as a factor but not "racial stratification."

In this essay I shall use the concept of "race" in its cultural sense rather than in its biological meaning. Biologically race refers to subspecies that are defined by gene frequencies.²³ Culturally race refers to what members of a society mean by it. For example, Americans believe and say that blacks and whites have some innate and physical differences and therefore that they belong to two different races. But this is a cultural or folk classification rather than a biological one because Americans classify anyone as black if he or she is known to be an offspring of black and white mating or has even slightly Negroid features regardless of his or her innate make-up. And it is this cultural definition of race which underlies the mutual perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of black and white Americans in and out of school.

But race is an important variable in determining school effectiveness only when the races are stratified. Membership in different racial categories per se does not necessarily result in lower school performance, as can be seen by comparing white (Caucasian) Americans with the non-white Asian Americans;²⁴ nor does membership in the same racial category necessarily result in similar

school performance, as can be seen by comparing the Oriental Jews with the Ashkenazi Jews in Israel;²⁵ or by comparing the Burakumin outcasts and non-Burakumin students in Japan;²⁶ or even by comparing different Caucasian groups in the United States, such as Jews and non-Jews. It is when the racial categories are stratified so that each occupies a different ecological niche in the society that persistent differences in school performance emerge.

2. Racial Stratification vs. Class Stratification: Racial stratification and all that it implies for school effectiveness needs to be distinguished from other types of stratification and their educational consequences, particularly from class stratification. The differences between class stratification and racial stratification has been succinctly summarized by Berreman.²⁷ Basically, social class stratification is based on economic relations. The attributes (e.g., education, occupation, income, etc.) that determine a person's class membership can be acquired in the lifetime of an individual. Moreover, class stratification legitimizes social mobility so that an individual can move from one ranked class category to another by using the means prescribed by the system. Racial stratification, on the other hand, is not based on economic relations but on "social honor and privilege" or "status honor."²⁸ The attributes that determine a person's racial membership cannot be acquired in the lifetime of an individual but are regarded as inborn or "intrinsic to the individual."²⁹ Except through the painful act of "passing," an individual cannot move from one ranked racial group to another because such mobility and the means of achieving it are proscribed by the system. The two systems also differ in status summation, that is, in the extent to which social, economic, and political roles are distributed among members of stratified society according to the rank order of their group of origin rather than on the basis of their individual ability.

and training. In a class system individuals are not restricted largely to the roles typical of their class of origin regardless of their ability and training; status summation is low, especially in a relatively open class system. Under racial stratification, however, status summation is usually high; that is, there is a tendency for social, economic, and political roles to be ascribed on the basis of racial origin, especially for members of the subordinate racial group. As a result, the range of roles available to members of this group is limited.

The two systems of stratification also differ in the way that members of the subordinate group perceive and interpret their failures to achieve social, economic, and political self-betterment. According to Berreman, members of the lower class tend to "accept the social definition of the legitimacy of their status, and to feel individually inadequate or unfortunate." Therefore, their "class injuries" are "hidden in that their source in the shared experience of economic position [is] not apparent to those who suffer them."³⁰ In contrast, the injuries of race are not hidden:

---they are evident to those who are injured, because the individuals who make up the ranked entities are aware of their shared situation and its source in their group membership, its corporate activities, and the continuous, pervasive, and blunt sanctions which enforce group identity, group status, and the deprivation and denigration which accompany them. They have not themselves to blame, but the evaluation put upon themselves by others by virtue of their birth. They commonly see no fault in themselves despite religious, ethical, or genetic rationales propounded by the privileged; they resent and resist what they regard as unjust and iniquitous consequences of birth.³¹

Racially stratified groups are, of course, themselves internally stratified by class, but as I have tried to show elsewhere, the class systems of the subordinate racial group and the dominant racial group are not equal and are usually characterized by different patterns of social mobility.³² All these differences are relevant to the problem of school effectiveness and this relevance will be elaborated in regard to racial stratification.

3. Autonomous, Immigrant, and Subordinate Minorities: An ecological approach to the study of school effectiveness in a complex, plural society requires not only that we specify the nature of the ecological niches of the majority and minority groups and the different types of coexisting stratification systems, but also that we distinguish between different types of coexisting minority groups. This is particularly necessary for the United States, where some minorities such as American Indians, blacks, and Mexican Americans are far less successful in school than are other minorities such as the Arab, the Chinese, and the Japanese. Social scientists often explain the school failure of the former by referring to their cultural, environmental, or genetic deficiencies or differences, to the recency of their migration to the city, or to the organizational features of the urban school system. They probably attribute the school success of Arabs, Chinese, and Japanese students to their cultural, environmental, or genetic superiority, although few social scientists have actually studied these groups to provide the kind of empirical evidence needed for such a conclusion. I suggest below and have noted elsewhere that there are other significant differences between these two groups of minorities which influence their perceptions of and response to schooling.³³

Cross-culturally, and at least with respect to schooling, minority groups can be divided into three types. One type, autonomous minorities, are minorities primarily in a numerical sense. They may be distinguished from the majority group by their distinctive religion, language, or culture, but they do not suffer serious social, economic, or political subordination. Members of an autonomous minority group usually have more or less equal

access with members of the majority group to the social, economic, and political roles of their society on the basis of individual training and ability or any other culturally defined means of attaining such positions. Autonomous minority-group members require the same competencies as do members of the majority group for their roles in adult life, and the organizational features of their schools generally facilitate the development of such competencies. Moreover, the folk beliefs of autonomous minorities strongly support positive perceptions of schooling and schooling efforts. Autonomous minorities are therefore not usually characterized by lower school success than the majority group. Such minorities are found mainly in Africa and Asia, where several ethnic groups may have joined to form new nation-states. In the United States, Jews and Mormons probably represent this type of minority groups.

At the opposite end of the scale are subordinate or caste-like minorities whose relationship with the dominant group is characterized by a rigid stratification by which the minorities are denied equal access to the social, economic, and political roles of their society. Their generally low-status roles require and facilitate appropriate adult competencies, which the organizational features of their school foster; their folk belief system about schooling provides only a weak support for academic striving. Subordinate minorities are usually characterized by lower academic success. Examples of this kind of minority group in the United States are American Indians, blacks, and Mexican Americans. American Indians were the original owners of the land who were conquered by white people, after which the whites placed them in a special subordinate relationship with the dominant society. Mexicans were also conquered in the American Southwest and then relegated to a subordinate

status, which was later extended to other Mexicans immigrating from Mexico. Blacks were brought from Africa to the United States as slaves, and after their emancipation both legal and extralegal devices were used to maintain their subordinate status.

In between the autonomous and the subordinate minorities are the immigrant minorities. One major feature of immigrant minorities is that they moved to their host society more or less voluntarily, except, of course, for political emigrés.³⁴ At least initially, immigrant minorities do not fit into folk model of social stratification constructed by members of the dominant group or scientific model constructed by the social scientists. The main reason for this is that as strangers immigrant minorities may not understand or accept any invidious definitions attached to their place in the social hierarchy by the dominant group, and they have certainly not internalized these definitions. Consequently, they can and often do effectively operate cognitively outside the established definitions of social status and social relations. Moreover, the initial reference group of the immigrants is not the elite of their host society but their own peers "back home" or in their immigrant neighborhoods. It is with the latter that they compare themselves and find much evidence of self-improvement for themselves and their children because of "better opportunities." Even though the immigrants may occupy low niches in the occupational structure, lack political power, possess low prestige, and live in segregated slums, these things do not define their true position in the social hierarchy because they do not reflect their cognitive map of the situation, which is a major basis for their behavior in school and elsewhere. In addition, unlike subordinate minorities, immigrant minorities have at least the symbolic option of returning to their societies

of origin or reemigrating to another host society, should their present situation become unbearable. Furthermore, since the main purpose of their immigration is to achieve self-betterment, they generally adopt instrumental attitudes toward their host society and its institutions, such as the school. This does not mean that immigrant minority children may not encounter language and other barriers in school which may result in some initial school failure. However, school failure as a permanent and persistent problem does not emerge among this type of minority. Examples of recent immigrant minorities to the United States are the Arabs, Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans.

11. Ecological Niche of the Black Minority Group

Historically in the United States the adaptation demanded by subordinate ecological niche of blacks has differed significantly from the adaptation demanded by the superior niche of the dominant whites, especially the middle-class whites. And this difference in adaptive requirements has had many implications for school learning processes and outcomes for the two racial groups.

During the reforms of the 1960s, the differential demands of black and white niches were not understood by social scientists, who often assumed that blacks occupied inferior social, economic, and political positions in society because they had not achieved the white middle-class type of school success. Some attributed their failure to do well in school to genetic factors; others attributed it to their environment.³⁵ But neither group inquired into the possible connection between patterns of black schooling and the adaptive competencies of their ecological niche.

Figure 1 is a rough schematic representation of the linkage between racial stratification, ecological niche, and schooling. As the arrows in

the diagram indicate, racial stratification results in blacks' occupying a subordinate ecological niche maintained through various mechanisms. This subordination has social, economic, political, and other institutional consequences which directly affect the process of schooling. A knowledge of the nature of and the basis of the subordinate black community is necessary for understanding the impact of various ecological factors on black schooling. I will not attempt to describe fully here either the nature or basis of that community. Elsewhere I have tried to show how structural barriers have created and maintained the kind of physical, psychocultural, and social features characteristic of the black community, the ghetto, which differentiate it from the white middle-class suburban community.³⁶ The job ceiling (see p. 25 below) and economic exploitation, residential segregation and discrimination, political exclusion and outside control, low expectations, and lack of recognition for individual accomplishments from the wider society create and maintain the physical, social, and psychocultural "environment" in the ghetto that is qualitatively different from the atmosphere of the middle-class suburbs. Certain physical conditions of the ghetto tend to converge to undermine the health of the residents, causing a high incidence of disease and death.³⁷ High rates of unemployment and underemployment, resulting from the job ceiling, lead to poverty and dependency on the welfare system, and to social pathology, such as juvenile delinquency, crime, drug addiction, and a general sense of powerlessness. These factors also contribute to the high incidence of single-parent families and to the emasculation of the ghetto male.³⁸

1. The Family: Since social scientists stress the importance of "the home" or "family background" in explaining differences in school learning

**RACIAL
STRATIFICATION**

Subordinate
Ecological
Niche

Processes of Subordination	Consequences of Subordination	Impact on Schooling
Economic exploitation and discrimination via the job ceiling	High rate of unemployment and underemployment; disproportional representation in low-status jobs; poverty and dependency on the welfare system for subsistence	1. Weak supportive beliefs about linkage between "educational credentials" and adult techno- economic roles; 2. Differential education: access to inferior education 3. Organizational features of the school act as mechanisms for transmitting inferior education
Political exclusion and lack of control	Underrepresentation in elective and appointive offices and other decision-making positions; lack of training in leadership skills	1. Feeling of Powerlessness in dealing with school authorities 2. Lack of verbal and other skills required by school political processes, leading to politic of confrontation
Residential segregation and discrimination	Ghettoization: Inadequate housing, resulting in physical, social, and psychological "environment" qualitatively different from middle-class suburbs	1. Undermined health, impeding learning; 2. Perception of the school as an alien institution and of teachers as outsiders
Low expectations and lack of recognition of individual accomplishments	Status mobility system which stresses alternative strategies for self-betterment compared to those of white middle class	1. Weak supportive belief system about achieving self-betterment through "educational credentials" 2. Lack of persevering academic efforts
Communal Separation	Development of distinctive but parallel institutions: Family Churches Media Play groups/peer groups Clubs and summer camp programs Preschool/Day care programs Social networks Relations with teachers	1. Lack of Concentration 2. Lack of serious attitude toward school and lack of persevering efforts 3. Lack of discipline in classroom 4. Truancy 5. Vandalism These are but a tip of the iceberg

Fig.1: Relationship between Racial Stratification, Ecological Niche, and Schooling

processes and outcomes and since they attribute the relatively poorer school performance of black children to the latter's family background, it is necessary to consider further the impact of the subordinate ecological niche on the black family, and through the family on black schooling.

The basic traditional orientation of the family in the United States is patriarchal: the man is the titular head of the family and is expected to be its breadwinner and protector. The woman has the responsibility of bearing children and caring for them while they are young; she also does the general housework.³⁹ Historically, the job ceiling or economic barriers against blacks greatly modified this family orientation among blacks: the marginal participation of the black male in the technoeconomic system from the very time he became a wage earner after emancipation meant that he was unable to act as an effective provider for his family. Greater opportunities for female employment, even though at a menial level, gave the black female a stronger economic base, which made her more or less the provider and the dominant figure in the family.⁴⁰ The introduction in the 1930s of government financial aid to families with dependent children (or AFDC) weakened rather than strengthened the position of the black male because families could/^{not} usually qualify for this kind of support if the husbands were present; furthermore, even when a family qualified for some supplemental payment, any additional earnings by a member of the family were deducted from the welfare payment.⁴¹ On the whole, the economic system, operating through the job ceiling, encouraged black and white families to develop in different directions: the economic system tended to strengthen the family authority of the white male and to weaken that of the black male.⁴²

2. Collective Social Identity: Another feature of the subordinate ecological niche is that of collective social perception. The type of community created and maintained within the ecological niche of blacks has increased the self-consciousness of blacks as a separate and subordinated people in American society. This sense of peoplehood is beyond anything the lower class of any other contemporary industrial society has achieved. More importantly, the sense of identity as an excluded, oppressed people is shared by blacks of all social classes because even the more affluent blacks were, until very recently, forced to live in the ghetto through housing and other discriminatory practices of the dominant group.⁴³ All black people, whether they live in the ghetto or not, are keenly aware of their more or less ascribed status and of the external forces that created and continue to maintain it. This situation leads to a deep sense of resentment, which I referred to earlier (p.16) and to which I shall return.

111. Technoeconomic Niche and Schooling

1. Job Ceiling and Occupational Status: I will not attempt to deal with all the processes of subordination and their consequences listed in the above chart, but will focus primarily on the economic dimension for three reasons. First, as already indicated, it is often assumed by social scientists and policymakers that blacks have high rates of unemployment and underemployment and they are overrepresented in both low-status jobs and among the poor because they lack adequate education for the more desirable, higher-paying jobs.⁴⁴ It is further assumed that their social and political participation will increase with improvements in their technoeconomic status, and that achieving higher economic status will enable blacks to move out of the ghetto into the suburbs. But as I have noted, blacks do not usually advance

occupationally in the same way as whites advance because of the job ceiling; therefore, their present occupational status cannot be explained in terms of lack of adequate educational credentials for better jobs, nor do blacks themselves believe that it is. My second reason for focusing on the economic dimension is that most Americans attach a great deal of importance to the kind of job a person does. Miller aptly describes the American folk belief about jobs when he notes that "it is the job that counts."⁴⁵ Americans further believe that the nature of one's job is determined by the nature of one's education.⁴⁶ The third reason for focusing on education and jobs is that there is more objective information on black occupational history than on their social and political histories.⁴⁷

Several studies have indicated that historically education has not served as a path to the same ecological niche in the occupational structure for blacks as for whites.⁴⁸ A concept I have found useful in analyzing the occupational and social experiences of blacks is job and role ceiling. The term job ceiling was initially used by Drake and Cayton and by Frazier to describe the employment experiences of blacks in Chicago and in the South respectively.⁴⁹ The term refers to three aspects of black employment experiences, namely, that blacks are not permitted to compete freely as individuals for any types of jobs to which they aspire and for which they are qualified; that they are not allowed to obtain their proportionate share of the highly desirable jobs solely because they are subordinate racial group members; and that as a result they are confined largely to the least desirable occupations. In terms of black experience American occupations break down into two categories, those above the job ceiling, which lie outside the ecological niche of blacks, and those below the job ceiling, which fall within the ecological niche of blacks. In

In current classification, the professional, technical, office, proprietary, clerical, sales, the skilled crafts, and related work are the jobs above the job ceiling. In American cultural idiom these are the most desirable jobs or occupations in terms of education, income, and social prestige. Jobs below the job ceiling which fall within the black ecological niche include semiskilled operative work, personal and domestic service, common labor, and farm labor. These are the least desirable jobs in the American cultural idiom. Jobs above the job ceiling are traditionally regarded as "white jobs," while those below the job ceiling are regarded as "Negro jobs." Exceptions occur, of course, when jobs above the job ceiling are found within parallel institutions in black communities.

Space will not permit a decade-by-decade analysis, but my own survey of black employment history in both North and South shows that this broad division of occupational roles has existed since blacks became wageearners after their emancipation. In periods of national crisis or labor shortages, blacks have made significant gains in occupational roles. These periods include the years of economic growth (1900-1908), of national emergencies or war periods (World War I, World War II, the Korean War), of restricted immigration of labor (1922-1929), and of intense pressures from civil rights groups (the 1960s). Advances in these periods were accomplished by means of executive orders, legislative action, and political pressures rather than through gradual changes in the dominant group members' conception of black status. More importantly, black occupational advances were not merely responding to their educational advances, although black education was important when national crises opened up new opportunities for them. The point to be stressed is that unlike the situation among whites, black occupational advances are not

a function of their own educational advances but rather are a function of administrative, political, and economic decisions made by the dominant group.⁵⁰ Many such decisions in recent decades, particularly since the 1960s, have made the racial stratification system less rigid and consequently have raised the job ceiling higher than ever before. But the job ceiling still exists, and blacks still occupy a largely inferior ecological niche because of their racial identity. They still do not believe that they can compete on a free and equal footing with whites for economic roles in adult life.⁵¹

2. Job Ceiling and Adaptive Competencies: Although there have always been studies showing that blacks and whites differed in the amount and type of "educational credentials" they possessed, until recently, there were no systematic studies comparing the work skills or competencies of the two racial groups. The 1976 national study of adult work skills and knowledge showed significant racial differences in both "basic skills" and other skills. The findings were not related to the types of competencies demanded of blacks under the job ceiling.⁵² For example, the study noted that blacks lagged behind whites in ^{computational} / and measurement skills, but it did not ask about the effects of generations of exclusion from jobs requiring computation and measurement skills on black development of these skills.

Other studies have shown that the two racial groups differ in the amount and type of academic credentials or diplomas they possess. These studies show that blacks lag considerably behind whites in their possession of diplomas for the more desirable occupations above the job ceiling. This disproportion has often been used to explain why blacks are underrepresented in the occupations above the job ceiling,⁵³ but such an explanation seems to miss the basic point. The essential question is: Given the operation of the job ceiling which relegates most blacks to occupational roles below the job ceiling, what kinds of competencies or diplomas do they need? If we focus our analysis on

how things actually are or work, not on how we would like them to be, there is no question but that the low-status occupations open to blacks under the job ceiling have required neither long periods of schooling nor high-quality education. In fact, until recently, highly educated blacks had access to high-status jobs or social and occupational roles primarily within segregated black communities and institutions in the South and in the urban ghettos of the North, where they generally received lower financial remuneration and prestige for their educational efforts than did their white peers. The better educated blacks were thus penalized by the stratification system in terms of employment opportunities, earnings, and recognition. Although this situation has been changing, especially since the early 1960s it still discourages many blacks from developing the competencies associated with high-status occupations. If proportionately more black parents are forced into jobs below the job ceiling, they will be able to afford to send proportionally fewer children to college. Only the brightest and most ambitious black students will be able to win scholarships; those of average abilities will almost certainly be relegated to jobs below the job ceiling, unlike many comparable whites. If proportionately more black parents are relegated to jobs below the job ceiling, they will be more likely than their white peers to transmit to their children the competencies required for the adult roles below the job ceiling. Furthermore, under this circumstance, more black children than comparable white peers are likely to perceive opportunities for desirable roles in adult life as limited and not worth the persevering efforts which school success requires.

3. Job Ceiling, Competencies, and Schooling: There are many ways in which blacks acquire the competencies demanded by their niche in the American

occupational structure. In this section I will discuss how one of these competencies--inferior educational preparation--is acquired through the process of schooling. I shall argue that blacks have historically had access to inferior education and that in addition certain school mechanisms have usually operated to ensure their inferior educational preparation. I shall use data from my research in Stockton, California, to illustrate these mechanisms.

(1) Differential Access to Education in Historical Perspective: The social and occupational roles traditionally open to blacks have required neither long periods of schooling nor high-quality education, as noted earlier. Education decision-makers seem to have been fully aware of this fact and have generally tended to provide blacks with the type of education that prepared them for their low-status roles in adult life. From my study of statistics and documents on blacks during most of their educational history, I have found that changes in black education usually occurred after changes were made, proposed, or anticipated in their social and technoeconomic status.⁵⁴ For example, in the South, (1) blacks were excluded from formal education during slavery partly because their role in the ecological niche did not require formal education. (2) When blacks were emancipated in 1863 but before they were given full citizen status of the United States, their ambiguous position affected the education offered to them by missionaries from the North. Partly because the missionaries were not sure that blacks would have access to roles open to adult whites and requiring white type of education (which was classical) and partly out of fear of Southern whites, they offered blacks mainly religious and moral education. (3) After the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution in 1866, which guaranteed blacks full citizenship, including the right to vote, black education temporarily took a new turn: the

northern missionaries and other benevolent societies broadened black educational objectives beyond moral and religious instructions in order to include the reading of New England textbooks; extracurricular activities included teaching black children the art of politics, such as campaigning and voting. The general orientation of black education seemed to be that of enabling blacks to attain equal status with whites in the social, political, and economic realms. (4) At the end of Reconstruction, between 1877 and 1900, conservative white Southerners who came to power set out to reestablish blacks as a racial caste, placing them at the bottom of the labor hierarchy and denying them equal political and social roles. Black education was redesigned to reflect their new subordinate status: both state and local authorities reduced financial support for black schools, increased the teacher-pupil ratios, and used other devices to make black education different from white education, reflecting the new pattern of racial stratification.⁵⁵ (By black education I mean the type of schooling experiences open to blacks). (5) Between 1900 and the early 1930s, with black status firmly fixed at the bottom of southern agriculture and industry, blacks were given "industrial" education, by which was meant the kind of education that prepared them for manual labor.⁵⁶ (6) However, from the late 1930s to 1953, a period when the nation's industrial development demanded workers more highly trained in "industrial" skills, blacks were denied adequate participation in the "industrial" education programs supported by state and federal funds.⁵⁷ (7) Perhaps the first time in which black education moved toward convergence with white education (in terms of access) before a change had occurred in their social, political, and occupational status was/with ^{in 1954} the school desegregation order of the United States Supreme Court. That order meant, in effect, that blacks and whites should receive equal education, although there was no complementary ruling or legislation that the two racial

groups should have equal access to the adult roles requiring school diplomas. The sequence of changes in black education in the North was similar to that in the South, although the periods were different.

(11) School Organizational Features and Adaptive Competencies: The organizational features of the school are the actual mechanisms by which black education has prepared most blacks for subordinate roles in society. These mechanisms can be divided into two groups: those that can be initiated by the powers-that-be outside the school, and those that operate within the school. The former—the gross mechanisms of educational differentiation—include school segregation, inadequate funding, inadequate facilities, and inadequate staffing. Their use to keep black education inferior has been so well and so repeatedly documented for every part of the country as to require no further elaboration here.

But there are also mechanisms of differentiation, which have been far less studied and are less well known, even though they are just as widespread and effective. These subtle devices, embedded in the organizational features of the school, include parent-teacher relations, the classroom reward system, misclassification and tracking or grouping for instruction; biased textbooks and biased curricula; inadequate and biased counseling services; and extracurricular activities that reflect black subordinate status.⁵⁸ Such devices still exist and have probably existed throughout the history of black education and in every part of the country, but they were not studied systematically until debates of the 1960s regarding the causes of black academic retardation.⁵⁹ The devices may operate along with the gross mechanisms in the same school, or they may operate in the absence of the latter.

I have reviewed elsewhere the functioning extent and consequences of these subtle devices, as have others.⁶⁰ Here I will summarize briefly the

situation in Stockton during the period of my fieldwork from 1968 to 1970, although I will not attempt to deal with all the organizational features of the school mentioned previously. Let me preface my presentation by emphasizing that the Stockton situation was not unique and no worse than has been described for other northern urban ghettos.

The problem with teacher relations and expectations in Stockton had at least two dimensions: one was a lack of mutuality between parents and teachers which prevented the two groups from communicating effectively about children's academic difficulties at formal meetings, such as the PTA or parent-teacher conferences; the other was the way in which teachers rewarded the children for their classroom performances. The reward system, I believe, among other things prevented the children from learning correctly how their school efforts were related to rewards in the form of marks or grades and prevented them from learning good study habits necessary for maximizing both efforts and rewards during their elementary school careers.

(a) Teacher-Parent Relations: Social and physical distance (all but one junior high school teacher lived outside the neighborhood) between teachers and parents resulted in reciprocal stereotyping and negative attitudes and expectations, which both teachers and parents shared with members of their respective communities. On account of this, contacts between teachers and parents, whether by phone, written messages, or in person, were at best superficial. The two groups did not trust each other's ability or commitment to the children's school success. As a result, teachers did not accept the parents' diagnosis of their children's academic problems; neither did parents accept the teachers' explanations of the same. Unfortunately this distrust was not substantially lessened when the school district initiated a program to

encourage teachers to make "home visits," the visits resulted in a new kind of stereotyping. Some parents complained that whereas previously some teachers had said that the families lived in "very deprived homes" and did not eat meals at tables and had no decent chairs and beds, they later said that the families were living luxuriously on welfare money.

(b) Classroom Reward System: I became aware of the potential problems in teachers' evaluation of their pupils' classroom efforts after one year of interviews with students of all ages and after observing their work habits in several classrooms as well as in their homes. These interviews and observations led me to think that most of the children did not seriously consider the effect of their efforts or work habits on their school marks. In fact, most of them did not seem to take their school work seriously. My interviews suggested that many children and their parents believed that there was what they called the "average grade" for the neighborhood, especially at the elementary school level, and that regardless of how hard a student worked in school he or she would not get higher than the average grade, which was something between C and D.

I was able to analyze the marks that had been received by the then grade 6 pupils over the previous five years under five or more different teachers. I wanted to see the extent to which the teachers gave the children the average grade and to compare this mark with the children's actual efforts or progress as perceived and indicated by the teachers themselves in their written comments on the children's official records. My analysis more or less confirmed that the average-grade phenomenon did exist for this particular group of students. Of the 17 students who received the mark of C for their classroom performance in grade 1 in 1964-65 school year and who were in grade 6 in 1968-69 school year, all but one (or 94.12%) had received the same C mark every successive

year. The one exception received a C+/B- one year. Yet written evaluation by the teachers suggested that there were differences among the 17 students in performance and in "progress" over the years. Unfortunately, I have not been able to extend my final analysis to the rest of the pupils in the same school for whom I have both marks for classroom work and teachers' written assessment. I have suggested elsewhere that one possible consequence of the teachers' failure to reward black students in proportion to their efforts is that the children fail in these crucial, formative periods of their school careers to learn the proper connection between appropriate academic efforts and school success.⁶¹

I have also recently suggested that the marks with which teachers reward the children for their classroom efforts were similar to the way that the Stockton community rewards adult blacks and Mexican Americans for their educational attainment in terms of jobs, wages, place of residence, and social position.⁶² Many parents and other adult informants repeatedly said during interviews that blacks were not generally hired, paid, or promoted according to their educational qualifications or ability. Some said that not long before 1968-70 some black college graduates had been employed as manual laborers.

Evidence before and during my fieldwork tended to support these descriptions of limited educational rewards. For example, Meer and Freedman report that before 1963 even professional blacks (teachers, social workers, physicians, etc.) with income and level of education far above the average for Stockton could not buy or rent homes in the northern part of the city, which is one of the most desirable residential areas.⁶³

In 1969, following repeated allegations by blacks and Mexican Americans of exclusion from better city jobs, the city council set up a "workshop in

equality," a public hearing committee, to investigate the matter. Both white and minority members of the committee agreed that the minorities were underrepresented in city government jobs, but disagreed about the reasons for underrepresentation in the more desirable jobs. Whites argued that the minorities were underrepresented because they did not score high enough in the civil service examination; blacks and Mexican Americans, on the other hand, insisted that the tests were biased against them and were intentionally used to exclude them from the more desirable jobs. To support their claim they cited cases in which minority people obtained and performed satisfactorily the same types of jobs with private companies that they could not obtain from the city because they did not score high enough on the civil service examinations. They also said that prisoners who had not taken examinations were given jobs for which nonprisoners were required to take civil service tests.⁶⁴

As I will attempt to show later, the failure of the wider society to reward adult blacks for their education generates a disillusionment about schooling which robs them of aspirations for continuing efforts. It also makes it particularly difficult for black parents to teach their children convincingly and effectively the "effort optimism" characteristic of the white middle class. But let us return to other organizational features of the school.

(c) Grouping for Instruction: Misclassification and Tracking: From an ecological perspective the most significant dimensions of grouping children for instruction are the bases used for assigning pupils to different groups, the beliefs and behaviors generated by the grouping practices, and their relation to the niche assigned to blacks in the wider society.

In Stockton grouping of students was based primarily on their scores on state-mandated standardized tests. Elementary, junior high, and senior high

principals often complained in their annual reports to the central administration that the test scores did not reflect their pupils' true abilities.⁶⁵ But these internal criticisms did not diminish the use of the test scores to classify and place the children into "ability groups" known as X, Y, and Z, with the majority of the blacks falling into the lowest ability or Z group. Black students were thus overrepresented in the groups destined for "watered-down curriculums" and "dead-end courses." Even the superintendent of the school district publicly admitted at a Board of Education meeting in 1969 that children placed in the bottom track were rarely able to progress to higher tracks because "once measured as 'slow' or 'low-achieving' the curricula are designed to agree with his slowness or low-achieving status. There is little opportunity to overcome the language or curricula disadvantage."⁶⁶ Some whose performances on the standardized tests did not qualify them even for the Z group were identified as Educable Mentally Retarded (or EMR) and sent to a special school which contracted with Goodwill Industries and other local agencies for the handicapped to take over when the children grew older and to prepare them for their place in the adult world.

The failure of black elementary school pupils to learn to maximize their classroom efforts obviously contributed to their low test scores. There were instances during my fieldwork that suggested that the pupils did not understand the purpose of the tests and did not take them seriously. But these factors were not usually taken into account when the test scores were used to classify and label the students for instructional and other purposes.

Other studies elsewhere have also found that students' scores on standardized tests are used to differentiate or track students for instructional and other purposes. For example, Mercer's study shows that the process of

classifying children in the public schools as either normal or mentally retarded results in the overrepresentation of blacks and Mexican Americans in the low-ability groups and those labeled as mentally retarded.⁶⁷ The process of classification and labeling is, of course, not confined to schools in the ghettos or barrios. Cicourel and Kitsuse describe how guidance counselors use the results of the test scores to assign suburban high school freshmen to various categories of course offerings, such as college preparatory, general, and commercial.⁶⁸ What has not been sufficiently studied are the teachers' beliefs about the "educability" of children placed in the lower tracks. Also not well studied is how the students who are labeled and tracked into low-ability groups perceive and respond to their situation. In my Stockton study it appeared that such students perceived themselves as regarded by both the school personnel and their schoolmates as "stupid," "dumb," "slow," and so on. They tended to have a very low opinion of themselves and their ability to "make it" in school.

Finally, we have almost no empirical studies of community perception of and reaction to the grouping phenomena. In Stockton it appeared that the local black community rejected the labeling and tracking of its children, but made no public protest against these practices before late 1960s. In 1967 some of its leaders organized a protest meeting and subsequently a school boycott to draw attention to their "demands" that, among other things, the tracking system be eliminated. The school superintendent responded favorably and asked the high schools to begin dismantling the tracking system in 1969-70 school year. This change enabled some Z-group students to take college preparatory courses like higher math, algebra, chemistry, physics, and senior biology. A high school counselor whom I interviewed a year later

reported that the Z-group pupils were not failing those courses.

(d) Guidance Counseling: The widespread use of guidance counseling as a mechanism for differentiating children in terms of curriculum areas (e.g., college preparatory, commercial, vocational, and general education) has been documented by a number of fieldworkers.⁶⁹ School guidance counselors in general believe rather firmly in the validity of the test scores, which they use to assign incoming high school freshmen to different curriculum areas and to deny students in other "tracks" the opportunity to take courses in the college-preparatory "track." Armor's study shows that counselors also use the test scores to lower rather than raise students' expectations by persuading them to make "realistic decisions" about their future based on their "abilities."⁷⁰ By channelling students into various educational tracks and using the notion of realistic decisions to keep them there, counselors eventually play a key role in the occupational choices of young adults, although their influence may not be obvious to the students, their parents, or even to the counselors themselves.

This problem of preparing children for adult occupational roles through guidance counseling has some particular twist in regard to blacks and other subordinate minority students. The first aspect has to do with the fact that blacks are generally overrepresented among those with low test scores. Although Stockton school principals and probably other school personnel doubted that the test scores reflected the pupils' true ability, counselors relied heavily on these scores for course assignments. As one counselor described it:

We were testing these kids and placing them in a tracking system. And this is why we...[had] three tracks: X, Y, Z. X track was the highest, with high scores, 7, 8, 9 [on the stennine scale]; Y [track] was the 4, 5, 6; and the Z [track] was the 1, 2, 3 group. Well, a large segment of these kids, mainly Negroes and Mexicans, I'd say, fall into this 1, 2, 3 group. And what we were doing was tracking them into a lower bracket on the educational scale. 71

A second dimension of the problem has to do with what the counselors perceived to be the sources of the children's problems in school and what they thought should be done about them. The "problem students" were primarily those from the Z track, who did not do any better in the courses designed for their group than the counselors would have expected them to do had they been placed in higher tracks.⁷² (The counselors generally said that it would be "unrealistic" to place Z students in courses for other tracks.) In addition, many of the Z students had discipline problems in the classroom. The counselors perceived both their academic and discipline problems as arising from "their home environment," which not only failed to socialize them properly for school success but was also ridden with parent-child conflicts and the like. The counselors, therefore, saw the children's problems mainly as psychological and social adjustment problems requiring therapy in the form of group counseling. Consequently, some counselors formed the students into groups to discuss their family and personal problems. The counselors hoped that these sessions would eventually lead to discussions of academic problems, but they rarely went beyond the therapy sessions. The counselors were influenced in their perception of and solution to the children's problems by two factors: they accepted rather uncritically the prevalent popular and "scientific" views being expressed at the time that the children came from "culturally deprived" or "culturally different" homes, with all that these labels implied for child development. Secondly, the counselors were understaffed, so that none of them had sufficient time to help many students who needed academic guidance, let alone those with disciplinary problems. But the therapy approach did not work partly because neither the students nor their parents accepted the counselors' clinical definition of and therapy approach to their problems. Most of the children had parents with little or no formal education. As the children, their parents, and other members of their community saw it, what the children

really needs was to have the counselors show them how to succeed in school and eventually in the post-school world. Specifically, they wanted the counselors to help the children understand that they would get better marks if they put more efforts into their schoolwork; they also wanted the counselors to show them how they might go about preparing themselves to qualify for good jobs after they "finished school."⁷³

Finally, at least in Stockton, there appeared to be some correlation between tracking black students into the lower bracket on the academic scale and the type of educational preparation or competence required by their menial occupational roles in adult life. I have already mentioned the "workshop on equality" which was sponsored by the city council to deal with the alleged exclusion of minorities from the more desirable jobs in departments of the city government. Several informants, including school personnel, reported that in the past most blacks, whether city employed or not were relegated to menial jobs requiring little formal education and that black students were often advised to prepare themselves educationally for employment sectors typically open to blacks. This situation was not unique to Stockton, for I have discussed the matter with blacks from other parts of the United States and have been told repeatedly that school guidance counselors generally advised blacks to prepare themselves for occupations usually open to blacks. The extent to which the raising of the job ceiling since the 1960s has affected this aspect of the counseling problem is a matter to be studied.

(e) Curricula and Textbooks: Arguments have been made that the traditional white middle-class curricula are not suitable for black students, who should be given more "relevant" curricula.⁷⁴ This thinking has led to efforts to introduce such "relevant programs," primarily in language, history, and

social studies.⁷⁵ The programs are reported to be very effective in strengthening black pride and identity, but it has not been shown that they are equally effective in promoting higher standardized test scores.⁷⁶ Some would argue that this is not the intention, but it should be pointed out that almost all proposals for funding such programs suggest directly or indirectly that their major goal is to encourage greater academic success.

From an ecological perspective, the problem is not so much that black students are taught the standard white middle-class curriculum as it is that they are given the curriculum and textbooks that prepare them for future adult roles in a subordinate ecological niche. In the past blacks either were given an "industrial curriculum" with manual training or they were given courses that prepared them for typical black jobs in their local communities.⁷⁷ Marshall reports a study in 1960 by Vivian Henderson in which she found that black students in Nashville, Tennessee, took only vocational courses in the jobs traditionally held by blacks. Marshall summarizes Henderson's findings as follows:

The white schools offered courses in electronics, IBM, refrigeration, air conditioning, drafting, radio, television and electronics. The Negro schools offered courses in tailing, bricklaying, cabinet-making, and diversified occupations, to include cook, maid, maintenance and dietetics.⁷⁸

Research in more recent years into the differential curriculum in the North has generally stressed different kinds of biases, namely, the teaching of white middle-class culture and the neglect of black culture and of black contributions to American life. It seems to me that we ought to study more specifically how the explicit and hidden dimensions of the curriculum directly and indirectly both reflect and reinforce blacks' menial social and occupational roles. The new literature on sex bias in the school seems to suggest that this could be a fruitful line of research for other subordinate groups.⁷⁹

Textbooks are another aspect of the curriculum which both reflect and reinforce the low status of blacks. History and social science textbooks have tended to give a false picture of American society and to stereotype blacks in their subordinate roles. In this way they have conveyed indelible messages to both blacks and non-blacks which have reinforced the subordinate status of the former.⁸⁰

Curriculum and textbook stereotypes were evident during my fieldwork in Stockton. Before 1967, for example, the history and social science curriculum made almost no mention of the significant contributions of blacks and other minorities to the history, culture, and economy of the United States, or else described minorities and their roles in a stereotypic manner. The black community was fully aware of these biases and resented them, but did nothing until 1967. Then its spokespersons "demanded" and got the school district to remove the textbooks containing the deprecating references and to replace them with books that incorporated minority contributions. New courses were subsequently designed to include minority contributions as a central part of the history curriculum.⁸¹

The impact of the community in other curriculum areas was limited by a lack of specific knowledge.

4. The Job Ceiling and Adaptive Motivational and Cognitive Skills: The argument of the last section was that the school responds to the job ceiling by giving blacks appropriate educational preparation or competencies for the level of jobs open to them. As the level of the job ceiling rises, requiring higher educational preparation, the school responds accordingly by increasing black educational preparation. In this section I want to discuss how the same ecological factors, especially the job ceiling, influence the motivational and cognitive skills or competencies that black children develop, bring to school,

and eventually take to their roles in adult life. Why are blacks characterized by certain types of cognitive and motivational skills and strategies as inventoried by various tests? How do blacks acquire such skills and strategies? In the course of discussing both issues I shall comment on the interrelationship between these characteristic skills and general school effectiveness among blacks.

(1) Black-White Differences and the "Failure-of-Socialization" Hypothesis: It is generally said that the type of cognitive and motivational skills children bring to school greatly affects the ability of the school to educate them.⁸² Some children seem to have the right motivational and cognitive skills and therefore do well in school; others fail to do well because they come to school with the wrong kinds of such skills.⁸³ Studies of blacks and whites show that the two racial groups differ in cognitive and motivational skills.⁸⁴ These findings have been used by some scholars to explain why schools are less effective in educating blacks.⁸⁵ It is further said that blacks differ in cognitive skills because black parents fail to socialize their children as white middle-class parents socialize theirs. The main point of the failure-of-socialization hypothesis is that the racial differences in cognitive and motivational skills are ultimately due to racial differences in socialization processes. The policy implication of this is that the school performance of black children can be raised by resocializing them directly in the manner of white middle class or by training their parents to use white middle-class childrearing techniques to train their own children.⁸⁶

The failure-of-socialization hypothesis is inadequate on two grounds. First, it fails to consider the connection between the motivational and cognitive differences and the motivational and cognitive demands of the niches assigned to blacks and whites. Second, it does not distinguish between the process by which

a given generation of each racial group acquires and transmits its motivational and cognitive skills from the reason for the prior existence of such adaptive skills. I suggest that blacks and whites do not differ in motivational and cognitive skills merely because they differ in the way they train their children. I further suggest that it is both methodologically and theoretically wrong to evaluate the black socialization process as inferior to white unless it is first shown that the two processes have the same goal, that is, that they are directed toward producing people with the same skills and strategies. As will be shown below, however, the available roles in the ecological niche of blacks seem to require and promote a distinct cognitive and motivational pattern.

(11) Black Motivational Patterns: Blacks do not differ from whites in terms of their achievement goal, which for both is economic self-betterment. But the job ceiling forces blacks to develop different skills and adopt different strategies to reach their goal. White people, especially middle-class whites, believe that they can attain (and traditionally have attained) economic self-betterment by obtaining appropriate educational credentials or diplomas; blacks, on the other hand, tend to believe, on the basis of their past experiences, that educational credentials are not sufficient to enable them obtain the same economic self-betterment, and that in addition they often need the patronage or sponsorship of white people or white organizations. Moreover, out of their historical experiences blacks have also come to believe that sometimes economic self-betterment can more easily be achieved through other strategies like collective protests and boycotts, litigation against discriminatory employers and labor unions, and the use of public agencies dealing with complaints of employment discrimination.⁸⁷ These beliefs significantly influence black children's expectations about their future and their schooling.

The strategy which serves the dominant group members, namely, academic credentials (or "talent and merit," as Jensen calls it.⁸⁸) encourages middle-class whites to develop the kinds of insights, initiative, industriousness, perseverance, and individualistic competitiveness which promote the white middle-class type of school success. White middle-class parents begin to teach these skills to their children in infancy not merely because the children will need such skills to succeed in school but also because they will need them as adults to achieve economic self-betterment. White middle-class schools, of course, reinforce the same skills. The academic credentials which the children obtain serve as the best evidence they can present to their future employers that they have successfully acquired the motivational skills or strategies needed in the more desirable jobs and social positions in society. These skills are later reinforced by their experiences in such jobs and positions, and by the feeling that they got the job befitting their educational qualifications, that they are receiving wages commensurate with their education and job, and that they are receiving appropriate advancement. Later, as parents, the white middle-class workers transmit to their children not only specific motivational skills but also the supportive feelings and beliefs which encourage the types of motivational skills associated with their adaptive strategy for economic self-betterment, namely, school success or academic credentials.

The job ceiling discourages many blacks from developing such supportive beliefs and feelings and from emphasizing educational efforts and credentials in their quest for economic and social self-betterment. Instead, the job ceiling encourages them to acquire white patronage or sponsorship and to develop those skills necessary for achieving and maintaining this sponsorship. Black adaptation under the job ceiling requires them to be manipulative,

compliant, and deferential, and their low-status jobs and patterns of social and occupational advancement reinforce the same skills. Blacks transmit these skills to their children because they are functional. Like white children, black children begin to acquire these skills in infancy as part of their overall preparation for adult competence in their ecological niche. The school, for its part, reinforces the development of these skills by what and how it teaches and treats black children.⁸⁹ In some cases black children learn quite early in their school career that the school personnel treats them differently and that in order to get along with their teachers they must learn to be manipulative, compliant, and deferential. As black children grow older their experiences further encourage these types of behavior, for they begin to see them as a necessary part of adjustment to black adult life. In this context they acquire the motivational skills which do not facilitate the same school success achieved by the white middle class.

The point to be emphasized is that in any society or social group, it is the nature of the status mobility system or the reward system which determines the prevalent motivational skills and strategies of its younger generation. What determines white middle-class school success is the type of status system that operates among white middle-class people. Achievement motivation with regard to academic accomplishment or any other type of accomplishment is intrinsic only insofar as that accomplishment is or has been historically experienced and interpreted by members of the society or social group as materially or psychologically rewarding and has become a part of their folk system. Children are socialized into the pattern of achievement motivation preexisting in their society before their particular families were formed. When a society is stratified by birth-ascribed status, as in the case of racial or caste

stratification, its mobility system is usually differentiated to reflect the unequal status of the different groups in the social hierarchy. American racial stratification has generated a mobility system in the subordinate black group which de-emphasizes academic achievement as the strategy for social and economic self-betterment. And it is probably on account of this that black students do not exert the same amount and kinds of efforts as do white middle-class students to maximize their school performance.

(iii) Black Cognitive Skills: Psychologists stress the importance of cognitive skills not only for the middle-class type of school success but also for competent performance of middle-class occupational roles. However, they have not considered how middle-class schooling and middle-class jobs might influence these same skills. Since psychologists have not studied this kind of reciprocal relationship, we have no empirical data with which to attempt a description of the nature of this relationship. Nevertheless, it is my hypothesis that such a reciprocal relationship exists and that, in particular, performing middle-class jobs facilitates the development of middle-class types of cognitive skills. And it is these adaptive or functional cognitive skills that are transmitted by the family and the school.

Findings in cross-cultural studies lend some support to the hypothesis. These studies suggest that participating in Western-type education or in Western-type economic system or occupational roles influences non-Western peoples to develop Western-type cognitive skills.⁹⁰ This kind of change would then suggest that, perhaps, different levels of technoeconomic roles and different types of schooling within Western societies themselves might encourage the development of different types of cognitive skills. Indeed, I will go so far as to suggest that occupational roles above the job ceiling demand and promote certain kinds

of cognitive skills, while the occupational roles below the job ceiling demand and promote other types.

The work of some scholars within the United States, although it does not focus on cognitive skills, does suggest a parallel development in the cognitive domain. I have already discussed Inkeles' writings on the relationship between society's repertoire of social, economic, and political roles and adult competencies.⁹¹ Kohn's finding that parental occupational activities influence their childrearing values is also relevant. According to Kohn, parents whose work situation permits them a good deal of autonomy tend to value autonomy and promote it in their children.⁹² Scrupski argues that jobs above the job ceiling, namely, the professional, technical, managerial, official, and similar jobs, allow their incumbents a good deal of independent judgment, flexibility, and self-direction--skills that are valued by the incumbents and instilled in their children.⁹³ These adaptive skills are not found to the same degree among those who are excluded from high-status jobs by the job ceiling.

Using the same reasoning, I suggest that white middle-class people conceptualize, think, solve problems, and speak the way they do because these are cognitive skills required and encouraged by their jobs, or more broadly, their social, economic, and political roles in society. I further suggest that white middle-class people come to value these cognitive skills and transmit them to their children because these skills are functional or adaptive. Vernon reminds us, however, that these Western middle-class cognitive skills have not always existed among Western middle-class people, but have emerged in the context of modern Western activities, such as scientific analysis, scientific control and exploitation of the physical environment, and large-scale and long-range planning and implementation.⁹⁴ People in non-Western societies who are involved in other kinds of activities developed different cognitive skills

more adaptive to their own needs. But the historical change in the cognitive skills of Western middle-class people observed by Vernon and the contemporary cognitive changes among non-Western peoples noted by cross-cultural psychologists suggest to me that increasing the opportunities for blacks and similar subordinate groups within Western societies to participate in high-status social, occupational, and political roles and in better-quality education will eventually result in their developing adaptive cognitive skills similar to those of the white middle class.

(iv) Acquisition of Adaptive Cognitive Skills: Both the family and the school play important roles in the transmission of adaptive motivational skills, although the family's role in cognitive socialization has received more attention from social scientists. Comparable studies of cognitive socialization usually assume that the white middle-class process is the ideal and that blacks and other subordinate groups ought to follow it. It is said that white middle-class children are exposed to many situations that help to develop their intellectual skills (e.g., they are exposed to books, travel, toys, and other educational experiences). Furthermore, these types of socialization provide the children with optimum intellectual stimulation through more conversation, explanation, and both direct and indirect teaching.⁹⁵ No one denies that these things enable white middle-class children to develop middle-class cognitive skills. What needs to be added is that this process of socialization is probably the most appropriate for enabling these children to acquire these cognitive skills, but not necessarily to acquire other types of cognitive skills, such as those adaptive for people who occupy low-status roles. But the fact that the process of acquisition is different for subordinate minorities than it is for the white middle class does not make it inferior or less effective. Effectiveness cannot be assessed except in relation to the goal of producing adaptive

cognitive skills: middle-class cognitive socialization is effective insofar as it transmits the cognitive skills required by middle-class white, just as black socialization is effective in transmitting to black children the skills needed in black social, occupational, and political roles. Neither parents can transmit to their children cognitive skills that they themselves do not possess; neither possess cognitive skills that are not functionally adaptive for them. And neither group can be blamed for not transmitting to their children nonexistent, nonfunctional cognitive skills.

No one has studied the process of cognitive socialization in Westernizing societies. I suggest that such a study would also be highly instructive in dealing with subordinate minorities in Western societies themselves. I will explain what I mean through some speculation about cognitive socialization in industrializing or Westernizing societies. The first generation of non-Western people in contact with Western-type schooling and Western-type social, occupational, and political roles usually acquires some Western-type cognitive skills ^a after their early childhood socialization (i.e., when they attend/Western-type school or become involved as adults in a Western-type bureaucracy or economic system). Various members of the first generation will certainly differ in the amount of Western-type cognitive skills they acquire because they will differ in the number of years they participate in Western-type schooling and occupational roles, and not because of differences in their early childhood cognitive socialization. Provided that Western-type cognitive skills acquired by the first generation are functional, members of the first generation will begin to transmit these cognitive skills through family socialization when they establish their own families and have children. One expects that the socialization of these cognitive skills will increase in subsequent generation, although it

will long coexist with other means of acquiring the same skills (e.g., through participation in the social, economic, and political roles in adult life).

These speculations lead me to suggest that if one wishes to see blacks and other subordinate groups in the United States develop the kinds of cognitive skills now characterizing white middle-class people, the best way to do it is to increase black participation in white middle-class types of social, economic, and political activities. The cognitive consequences of such a change will soon show up in both black adult participants and their children. Furthermore, this process of cognitive change, I suggest, is one which is not likely to be plagued with the problem of "fade-out" because the new skills emerge in response to adaptive requirements.

5. The Job Ceiling and the Response to Schooling: There exist only a few systematic studies of how blacks perceive, think, and feel about the job ceiling and the general conditions of life in the ghetto.⁹⁶ Even fewer studies have been conducted on the relationship between blacks' perception of and feelings about their opportunities in the post-school world and their response to schooling. However, enough evidence can be gathered from various sources to indicate the ways in which these perceptions do influence their schooling.

(1) Perception of the Job Ceiling: There is a good deal of evidence about that blacks are bitter/and frustrated by the job ceiling against them, as can be seen from the amount of time, resources, and efforts they expend trying to break through or circumvent it. Their bitterness and frustrations are documented for various periods and regions in ethnographic studies of black communities,⁹⁷ as are their strategies for breaking through or circumventing the job ceiling, such as "Uncle Tomming," boycotting, protesting, rioting, and appealing to the courts, to Fair Employment Practices Commissions, and to other such bodies.⁹⁸

(11) Opportunity Structure, Peer Groups, and Parental Influence on Schooling: Although blacks usually express high educational aspirations for themselves and their children, and although they try in many ways to change the education system so that their children will receive more and better education, many black children do not work hard in school to achieve white middle-class type of school success. The contributions of the classroom reward system to this situation was discussed earlier. What needs to be stressed here is the influence of parents. Some black students probably do not take their schoolwork seriously because their parents have not taught them how to work hard in school; and their parents may have failed to teach them how to work hard in school because they themselves are not well educated. However, it should be noted that many immigrant minority children work hard and succeed in school even though their own parents are not literate or educated enough to teach them how to work hard in American school and may not even understand how the American educational system works.⁹⁹ The difference between blacks and immigrant minority parents is that although both may emphasize to their children the importance of doing well in school, immigrant-minority children are much more likely to believe their parents. Their acceptance arises partly from the fact that the immigrants have not experienced repeated failure to achieve social and economic betterment through formal education in their host society.

In contrast, black children are much less likely to believe their parents when the latter talk to them about the importance of doing well in school because neither the parents' own personal experiences nor those of many other ghetto adults provide strong evidence to support the claim that school success leads blacks to economic self-betterment, especially relative to whites. As the children themselves grow older and increasingly perceive and interpret their future opportunities relative to white opportunities, their parents' teaching about the importance of school success becomes less and less convincing. Black

children compare themselves unfavorably with their white peers, whose future employment opportunities they perceive and interpret (perhaps not always correctly) to be unlimited. The employment history of their parents, as well as their own experiences when they begin to look for part-time or summer work, combine to prevent them from developing a strong supportive belief that school success will indeed enable them to achieve success comparable to that of the white middle class.

Collective experiences under the job ceiling and the interpretations of these experiences provide the context for the academic influence of peer groups in ghetto schools. Lacey's study among lower-class boys in England shows how an anti-school peer group culture emerges from both academic and behavioral factors in the classroom and how it is reinforced by other factors like family background and by interaction among students themselves in extracurricular activities.¹⁰¹ Cicourel and Kitsuse note that the administrative organization and personnel decisions of American high schools initiate and reinforce the polarization of the student body into subcultures, including the subculture of "deviant careers."¹⁰² And in a series of papers, Polk, Schafer, and their associates attempt to show how school failure is related to juvenile delinquency.¹⁰³ The school may emphasize the importance of doing well academically; likewise, parents, the media, and community agencies may stress the importance of school success. But these teachings prove relatively ineffective when black children themselves do not perceive that "school success" will bring them rewards in adult life.

(iii) The School and Other Settings in the Subordinate Ecological Niche:

Although I have not discussed the teachers' social life or their social networks, I have noted that parent-teacher relationships are influenced by the stereotypes and expectations that teachers bring from their own communities. Insofar as the

ghetto school is concerned, teachers are a part of the dominant group. There are no studies of teachers' unions with specific regard to their effects on black schooling. However, teachers' unions probably exert a good deal of indirect influence on school learning processes and outcomes among blacks and other subordinate groups. Generally teachers unionize in order to deal more effectively with the administration over labor matters and professional interests, including, of course, articulating their own notions of what makes for more effective education.¹⁰⁴ However, the implementation of teachers' notions of more effective education does not necessarily lead to greater school effectiveness.¹⁰⁵ Teachers' unions appeal to parents and the community for support mainly in times of disputes with the administration. On the other hand, teachers' unions do not specifically address themselves to problems of role stratification and the relationship between learning processes or school organizational features and the stratification of competencies. They make no serious efforts to understand parents' folk system about schooling and do not explain their own to parents. There are indications of distrust and occasional open clashes between teachers and ghetto parents, all of which go to undermine the ability of the ghetto school to educate its pupils.

Two related settings that deserve a closer look in the context of the ecological framework are day care and preschool programs. Both coexist within the ghetto, and both are frequently discussed in terms of their contributions to the later school careers of black children. Both programs also exist in white middle-class communities, where they have different histories, aims, organizations, methods, and outcomes.¹⁰⁶

Formal day care programs are intended to take care of children in the absence of their working parents, especially the mothers. In the United States

formal day care dates back to the late nineteenth century, when it was more or less a social movement organized to assist working mothers, mainly European immigrants. Day care centers, called day nurseries, also often acted as employment agencies, assisting such mothers to obtain domestic and other menial jobs while taking care of their children during their working hours. The educational goal of the programs was to Americanize both the mother (through work) and the child (through center programs). Day care programs expanded during World War II to include children whose mothers worked in war-related industries. Since the 1960s the number of day care programs has expanded greatly as part of the federal government's war on poverty.¹⁰⁷ Middle-class people have also increased their use of day care programs, although for a different reason: increasing numbers of middle-class women are returning to work or to school.¹⁰⁸

Black participation in formal day care programs began during World War II and increased greatly during the 1960s.¹⁰⁹ But formal day care centers for blacks differ from those for the middle class in that the programs for blacks are primarily sponsored by public agencies, churches, and other charitable organizations. Such programs are usually stigmatized by middle-class people, who prefer private programs. Another difference is that white middle-class participation in day care programs is more voluntary, usually resulting from the mothers' personal decisions to return to work or to school. Most blacks participate in day care programs on an almost mandatory basis, because they are in Work Incentive Programs or other government-sponsored manpower training and job placement programs designed to reduce their dependence on public assistance; again, blacks are required to enroll their children by local welfare agencies as likely to benefit from the programs, regardless of their parents' work status. In general, the increase in black participation in day

care programs since the 1960s is due to government's decision to reduce the number of black households on welfare now and in the future because such households have been increasing at a phenomenal rate. For example, in 1973 almost one out of every three black households was headed by a female, as compared to one out of every ten white households; and one out of every two female-headed black households was on welfare, as compared to one out of every five white households headed by a female.¹¹⁰

The linkages between ghetto day care programs and ghetto schools are varied, depending on the nature of such programs. Some day care programs are merely custodial, while others have educational and developmental aspects which tend to make them a preparatory ground for later formal schooling. When the latter is the case the school controls the day care activities and personnel. Although some parents are actively involved in school-run day care programs as aides or advisors, the lack of communication between parents and teachers is also apparent here. Particularly significant is the fact that parents and staff of the school- or university-sponsored day care programs do not share the same folk belief system about the educational and developmental values of the programs. This difference in belief systems has not been systematically studied, but it probably contributes to the relative ineffectiveness of many such programs as a preparatory ground for later formal education.

In contrast to day care programs, which primarily offer custodial care, preschool programs are essentially educational programs for children. Here too, black participation is of more recent development and is based on different theoretical and policy assumptions than white middle-class participation.

A few preschool programs for blacks began in the early 1960s as experiments to resocialize black children to develop white middle-class types of cognitive

and motivational skills.¹¹¹ The number of ghetto preschool programs increased tremendously with the establishment of federal Head Start programs in 1965 as one of the strategies by which the government sought to break the "cycle of poverty." It was assumed that ghetto parents were poor because they were unemployed, and that they were unemployed because they lacked adequate education. It was further assumed that such parents could not and did not socialize their children to achieve white middle-class school success in order to qualify them for well-paying jobs as adults, and furthermore, that poor parents tended to transmit to their children illiteracy and poverty status, repeating the cycle of poverty in the next generation.

are
Many of the programs/run by the public schools; some by university-based child development centers; and others by churches and other community organizations. All these programs share the common belief that the children's "home environment" is the prime cause of their failure to develop the proper kinds of cognitive and motivational skills. It is said that ghetto parents fail to provide their children with adequate "stimulation" and health and nutritional care. Preschool programs are designed to eliminate or prevent the "developmental deficiencies" inherent in the ghetto home environment.¹¹² The children are said to come from "culturally deprived" or "culturally disadvantaged" homes, where they do not receive adequate cognitive and motivational stimulation.

Again, as in the case of day care programs, parents participate in various capacities, as aides, advisors, and so on. Effective parent participation is limited by several factors: many parents do not share the theoretical assumptions underlying these preschool programs; few of them understand the assumptions or know about them. Nor is their participation wholly voluntary

because their children are often certified for the programs by local welfare agencies as, for example, was the case in Stockton during the late 1960s. Some ghetto parents, of course, strongly identify with the programs (some because they gain materially as employees or psychologically as spokespersons for the community), but many black parents remain privately critical of the programs.¹¹³

Many preschool programs probably fail in their educational objectives because they are not supported by parental or community folk beliefs about child development and schooling and because they make no efforts to understand the community folk belief system or explain theirs to parents.

(iv) Black Schooling and Emergent Societal Forces: How will the following emergent societal forces affect the ecological relationship in ghetto schooling: declining enrollments, mainstreaming, federal courts participation in school operation, and increasing participation of women in the labor force? I am not familiar with the literature on mainstreaming and federal court participation in school operation and will not attempt to discuss them, but will discuss the two other factors.

Declining school enrollment will, first of all, adversely affect the distribution of blacks in jobs within the education system itself. Declining enrollment will result in reduction in the number of school employees, either through termination of some already on the job or through attrition by retirement. Blacks and members of other subordinate groups are the ones likely to be terminated because they lack seniority, most of them having been hired since the 1960s through affirmative action and similar programs. This is what happened in Berkeley, California in 1977. If the number of employees is reduced through retirement or slowdowns in hiring, blacks and other subordinate groups find it difficult to compete successfully with whites for the few occasional openings.

Second, by retarding the movement of blacks into teaching and other high-status jobs within the education system, declining enrollments will also retard black acquisition of the competencies required for such jobs. It will further weaken black folk beliefs about schooling, since teaching and other school jobs have recently represented for blacks one of the few areas of expanding opportunities. Third, declining enrollments are likely to increase school segregation, partly because the population of the white middle class is declining faster than that of blacks, and partly because white flight to the suburbs and into private schools leave most blacks in the city public schools. The consequences of increased segregation may be the intensification of the classroom and school dynamics discussed earlier, which act as a mechanism of educational differentiation.

Increasing participation of women in the labor force will not necessarily affect the ecological relationship described in the framework insofar as subordinate minorities are concerned. However, changing the nature of black women's (and black men's) participation in the labor force will certainly affect these ecological relationships. Black women have always had a higher rate of labor force participation than white women, but that has not improved school effectiveness for blacks.¹¹⁵ From an ecological perspective it is the increased participation of black women in jobs above the job ceiling which is likely to have a significant positive influence on the schools and on black students. First, it will affect black girls' perception of their future opportunities; second, it will raise the types of adaptive competencies required and acquired by blacks for their new adult roles; third, it will influence the school to improve its strategies for preparing blacks for these roles; and fourth, it will influence black socialization goals, values, and practices in the direction of transmitting appropriate cognitive, motivational, and social skills

required by the high-status roles now open to them. Increasing participation of black men in jobs above the job ceiling will produce similar results, especially in the education of black males.

Part Three: CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON

1. America's Other Subordinate Minorities: American Indians, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans

1. Limited School Effectiveness: Many studies have shown that school effectiveness is very limited for American Indians, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and similar minorities in the United States.¹¹⁶ It is said that the schools are ineffective because these minorities do not speak English and possess cultures different from the culture of the white middle class.¹¹⁷ The differential language and culture hypothesis underlies the present remedial efforts to improve the school performance of these students through bilingual and bicultural educational programs.¹¹⁸

There is no doubt that children who do not speak English and who come from a different cultural background initially have difficulties learning in classrooms where the teaching is based on white middle-class culture and language. However, language and cultural differences do not persist for several generations as a barrier to school learning unless the groups are stratified into subordinate-dominant relations. Thus the children of some immigrant parents experience initial language and cultural problems in American schools and later overcome these problems, while other immigrant children do not. For example, in the 1930s the Stockton school system reported that children of Chinese, Japanese, and Mexican immigrants were all having language and cultural problems in school; by 1948 the Chinese and Japanese were reported to be doing as well or better than local whites. The 1948 report did not mention Mexican

immigrants specifically, but noted that local-born Mexican Americans in the majority were experiencing language and cultural problems in school and lagged far behind local whites in school performance.¹¹⁹

Reports from other countries lend support to the argument that language and cultural problems persist in schools that operate mainly under rigid social stratification. For example, in Britain children of immigrant Africans, Bangladeshers, East Indians, Pakistanis, Italians, Maltese, and West Indians all experience initial language and cultural problems in school; but it is among the most subordinated of these groups, the West Indians, that low school performance tend to develop as a persistent problem.¹²⁰ In New Zealand, children of Polynesian migrant laborers from other islands have initial language and cultural problems, as do local Maori children with similar language and culture, both groups being different from the white New Zealanders. It is reported that the children of migrant Polynesian laborers subsequently overcome their language and cultural barriers and do better in school than local Maoris, who are locked into a rigid racial stratification system with local whites.¹²¹ In sum, language and cultural differences have a more or less permanent adverse influence on school effectiveness when the minority groups are stratified so that language and cultural differences become boundary-maintaining symbols.

2. Subordinate Ecological Niches of the Language Minorities: Like black Americans, the American Indians, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans are linked with the dominant white group in a kind of racial stratification, although it is not as rigid as black-white stratification.¹²² Like blacks, these minorities occupy subordinate ecological niches characterized by low-status social, economic, and political roles requiring lower competencies than those associated

with white middle-class positions. Traditionally each of these subordinate minorities has faced similar job and role ceilings described earlier for blacks, and each has been forced to live in segregated communities--in barrios and reservations. But it is much more difficult to present good empirical evidence to show that historically educational credentials have not served these minorities in the same way they have served the white middle class. One problem is that the relationship between their educational achievement and their social, economic, and political opportunities has not been seriously studied; the other problem is that data for such a study are probably difficult to obtain, since some of these groups have at various times been defined as whites and then as non-whites.¹²³

Nevertheless, studies of more recent years clearly show that, for the Mexican Americans, at least, the job ceiling still exist. Because of lack of space I will briefly summarize one of these studies of the differential role of schooling in the opportunity structure for whites and Mexican American adults. Blair in 1972 compared Mexican Americans and Anglo whites (those of European descent) who had similar educational credentials and who resided in or near the same barrios in the city; he had another sample made up of Mexican Americans and Anglo whites who had similar educational credentials but resided outside the barrios.¹²⁴ In comparing each sample in terms of jobs and wages, Blair found that Mexican Americans not only held inferior jobs but earned substantially smaller wages than the Anglo whites with comparable school credentials: in terms of annual wages the gap was about \$880 for the barrio sample, and about \$1,710 for the non-barrio sample.¹²⁵ Blair estimates that the earning differential, which he calls the "schooling penalty" against Mexican Americans, was equivalent to average earning for two and one half years of additional schooling in the county. That is, the average Mexican American, whether immigrant or American-born, needed two and half more years of schooling to earn

as much as an Anglo in the same job. And this schooling penalty was higher for younger than for older Mexican Americans. More significantly, it was also higher for those Mexican Americans who graduated from high school or from college than for those who dropped out without getting a highschool diploma or college degree. As Blair points out, the messages from the American economic or reward system to the Mexican American youth and to the Anglo youth are quite clear but different: to the Anglo youth the message is compatible with the white folk belief that more schooling, especially a high school or college diploma, leads to greater opportunities for better jobs, wages, and social advancement; to the Mexican American youth (and to the youths of other subordinate minorities) the message is that the chances of narrowing the gap in jobs and wages are greater if they do not stay in school long enough to obtain a high school or college diploma.¹²⁶

3. Job Ceiling, Adaptive Competencies, and Schooling: The point made earlier in discussing the relationship between adaptive competencies and schooling for blacks under the job ceiling also holds for American Indians, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans. A number of studies have found that the organizational features of schools attended by these minorities embody the same mechanisms that operate to prepare blacks for their low-status social, occupational, and political roles.¹²⁷

4. Job Ceiling, The Folk System, and Schooling: Do situations such as that described by Blair also affect the manner in which American Indians, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans perceive and respond to schooling? This aspect of the problem has been far less studied among these subordinate minorities than among blacks, but there is no doubt that on the basis of their experiences in the opportunity structure these groups have also developed folk systems or

beliefs that provide only weak support for schooling efforts. A number of studies indicate that children from these subordinate groups begin to exhibit what Carter calls "mental withdrawal," which leads to increasing failure to achieve the white middle-class type of school success, just at the age when the children begin to realize the implications of their groups' position in the stratification system.¹²⁸ Bryde attributes mental withdrawal to the development of American Indian identity at puberty and subsequent feelings of alienation and loss of self-confidence.¹²⁹ Fuchs and Havighurst say that the fall in school performance begins before puberty and that it is due to Indian children's family background and culture conflict with the school.¹³⁰ In examining the Mexican American situation in the Southwest, Carter blames it on the features of school organization, especially on the rigid authority structure and an irrelevant curriculum.¹³¹ An interesting point is that the mental withdrawal problem is reported to be absent among new immigrants from Mexico and Puerto Rico.¹³² As in the case of blacks, I would suggest that changing the opportunity structure in adult life is probably the most effective way to change the folk system, the adaptive competencies acquired in school, and the dynamics of schooling, and thus to make their schools more effective.

11. The Problem of School Effectiveness Among Subordinate Minorities in Other Societies

The ecological approach developed in this essay is also useful in studying similar subordinate minorities in other societies. Two such minorities have been mentioned in the foregoing discussion, namely, West Indians in Britain and the Maori of New Zealand. To these may be added the scheduled castes (formerly the untouchables) in India and the Buraku outcastes in Japan (who are of the same Japanese racial stock but have traditionally been assigned

polluting occupations). With some slight variations, all these minorities are subordinated in a rigid stratification system similar to that against blacks in the United States.¹³³ They live in segregated communities; have access mainly to inferior social, occupational, and political roles which require different competencies than those required by members of the dominant groups; their schools embody various mechanisms similar to those already noted for blacks, which help to prepare them mainly for their low-status roles; and all these minorities have evolved folk systems out of their past and continuing experiences, which give very weak support to persevering efforts in school.¹³⁴ I have reviewed elsewhere the/school failures of these subordinate minorities, the dominant groups' explanations of that failure, and the ineffectiveness of remedial efforts by dominant-group members who are trying to improve their school performance.¹³⁵ In all these societies--Britain, India, Japan, and New Zealand--as in the United States, very little effort has been made to understand the type of ecological linkages described in this essay and their relevance for school effectiveness among the subordinate minorities.

Part Four. SOME RESEARCH SUGGESTIONS

The conceptual framework outlined in this essay suggests several lines of research into the ecological factors influencing school effectiveness. I will list a few of these.

1. Research into the Relationship Between Social and School Organization: One suggested outline of research might be to study the manner in which the school and classroom organization reflect the organization of society, including the local community. The purpose of this line of study would be partly to discover the adaptive functions of the school and partly to understand some of the

ecological constraints that are likely to render school reforms less effective. Rosalie Cohen's ideas on the relationship between changes in American economic organization and changes in school organization described above are suggestive of the kind of research I have in mind.¹³⁶

2. Research into the Relationship Between Schooling and Adult Roles: The most useful study of the linkage between schooling and adult social, economic, and political roles must focus on a specific population or specific populations. The suggestion here is not the study of the perennial debate as to whether schooling equalizes people's economic status.¹³⁷ My concern is not with schooling and equality but with schooling and equal opportunity. Here are three examples of specific problems that could be studied.

(i) The extent to which educational credentials or diplomas actually serve as passports to the social, economic, and other roles culturally defined as appropriate for those who have achieved these credentials or diplomas. Are there group differences in access to such roles in a given community, both historically and at the time of study? To what extent and in what ways is the experience of members of a given group related to their perception of and response to schooling?

(ii) What is the nature of the system of rewards for members of a given group in school and in the community? The school's reward system can be considered in terms of the extent to which children from a particular group are rewarded with grades and other symbols of achievement in proportion to their efforts. The community's reward system can be considered in terms of the extent to which members of the group are hired, paid, promoted, and granted other status symbols that the local community considers appropriate for people with their training, ability, and experience. Is there a relationship between the school and community reward systems? How do members of the groups

under study perceive and interpret their experiences? How does their perception of their experiences under the two reward systems influence their perception of and response to schooling?

(iii) What is the relationship between the outcomes of the schooling (e.g., credentials and cognitive and motivational skills) of a given group and the nature of the competencies required by typical adult roles available to adult members of the group? What are the mechanisms both in school and in the community by which the appropriate competencies are acquired? Are either the roles or their required competencies changing? In what direction and for what reasons?

3. Research into the Relationship Between Folk Systems and School Effectiveness:

People's folk systems provide a useful guide to understanding their perception and interpretation of "reality" and their subsequent behavior in a given situation, including the school setting. Here are a few examples of the many aspects of the linkages between folk systems and schooling that might be fruitfully studied in a given community.

(i) What is the nature and basis of the folk systems of different groups in the community, such as the white middle class, the white lower class, subordinate minorities, immigrant minorities, white ethnics, women, school personnel, adolescents, and so forth? Are the systems changing and why?

(ii) How does the folk system of a given group affect their perceptions of and response to schooling? Does the folk system provide a strong or weak support for persevering efforts in school, and for what reasons?

(iii) How does the folk system influence what parents (and other adults in the group) teach children about schooling, both directly and indirectly? To what extent does the folk system support or weaken such adult teaching?

(iv) What is the relationship between the folk system of a given group and that of children's peer groups on schooling?

(v) What is the nature of the folk system influencing preschool and day care programs? To what extent are the folk systems of the program sponsors, the staff, and the parents and community compatible or in conflict?

4. Research into Cognitive and Motivational Skills as Adaptive Competencies:

Research to date has focused on how different groups socialize their children (e.g., lower-class parents vs. middle-class parents; white middle-class parents vs. black and other subordinate minority-group parents, etc.), yielding rich and convincing evidence that these groups differ in their socialization practices or processes and that their children also differ in the cognitive and motivational outcomes. The generally accepted interpretation of the differences in outcomes is that they are a function of the differences in the socialization practices. The white middle-class practices and outcomes are also generally accepted as the best.

Our conceptual framework suggests that, contrary to the accepted view, the cognitive and motivational outcomes of the socialization processes of the various groups are a function of the differential requirements of adult social, occupational, and political life. From an ecological perspective the most crucial problem, requiring urgent study, is the linkage between the types of skills demanded by the adult roles of different groups and the outcomes of their socialization practices. Socialization process is the mediating variable, and changing it is not easy nor will it produce/lasting ^{any} result until the demands for these skills change when roles in adult life change. There is, in fact, no known instance in human history in which significant social, occupational, and political changes have taken place because of changes in

socialization processes or practices. Rather, changes in socialization generally follow social, occupational, and political changes. An ecological approach to socialization for the white middle-class type of school success is more than a study of how people socialize their children in their "natural settings." It is, rather, a study of the adaptive basis of prevalent cognitive and motivational skills, the types of socialization practices which produce the skills, and the conditions under which the prevailing patterns and processes may change.

REFERENCES

1. John R. Seeley, R. Alexander Sims, and Elizabeth W. Loosley; Crestwood Heights: A North American Suburb (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956), pp.292-339.
2. Thomas P. Carter, Mexican-Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970); John U. Ogbu; The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood (New York: Academic Press, 1974); Seeley, Sims, and Loosley, Crestwood Heights.
3. C. Lacey; Hightown Grammar: The School as a Social System (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970).
4. Frank Riessman; The Culturally Deprived Child (New York: Harper and Row, 1962).
5. David J. Armor; "School and Family Effects on Black and White Achievement: A Reexamination of the USOE Data," in On Equality of Educational Opportunity, ed. Frederick Moesteller and Daniel P. Moynihan (New York: Basic Books, 1972), pp.168-229; James S. Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966); Arthur R. Jensen; "How Much Can We boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" Environment, Heredity, and Intelligence, Harvard Educational Review, Reprint Series, no.6, (1969), pp.1-123.

6. James N. Anderson; "Ecological Anthropology and Anthropological Ecology," in Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology, ed. John J. Honigman ; (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 197), pp.179-239; Walter Goldschmidt; "Introduction," in The Individual in Cultural Adaptation: A Study of Four East African Peoples (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971), pp.1-22; Robert McC. Netting; Hill Farmers of Nigeria: Cultural Ecology of the Kofyar of the Jos Plateau (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968); June Helm; "The Ecological Approach in Anthropology," in Ideas of Culture: Sources and Uses, ed. Frederick C. Gamst and Edward Norbeck (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), pp.257-265.
7. Yehudi A. Cohen; "The Shaping of Men's Minds: Adaptation to the Imperatives of Culture," in Anthropological Perspectives on Education, ed. Murray L. Wax, Stanley Diamond, and Frederick Gearing (New York: Basic Books, 1971), pp.19-50.
8. John U. Ogbu, The Next Generation, pp.4-16.
9. David F. Aberle; "Culture and Socialization," in Psychological Anthropology, ed. Francis L.K. Hsu (Evanston, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1962), pp.381-399; David F. Aberle and K.D. Naegle; "Middle-Class Fathers' Occupational Role and Attitude Toward Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 22 (1952):366-378; Cohen, "Shaping of Men's Minds"; Alex Inkeles; "Social Change and Social Character: The Role of Parental Mediation," Journal of Social Issues, 11 (1955):12-23; "Social Structure and the Socialization of Competence," in Socialization and Schools, Harvard Educational Review, Reprint Series no.1 (1968), pp.50-68; "Society, Social Structure, and Child Socialization," in Socialization and Society, ed. John A. Clausen (Boston: Little, Brown, 1968), pp.73-129; Robert A. Levine; Dreams and Deeds: Achievement Motivation in Nigeria (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967); Robert A. Levine,

Nancy H. Klein, and Constance R. Owen; "Father-Child Relationships and Changing Life-Styles in Ibadan, Nigeria," in The City in Modern Africa, ed. Horace Miner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), pp.215-255; Melvin Kohn; "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships: An Interpretation," in Life Cycle and Achievement in America, ed. Rose Laub Coser (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp.21-48; D. Miller and G. Swanson; The Changing American Parent (New York: John Wiley, 1958).

10. John U. Ogbu; Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective (New York: Academic Press, 1978).

11. John U. Ogbu; "Socialization of Competence in a Double-track System," (A Paper presented at a meeting of social anthropologists in Berkeley, Calif., 1976).

12. Cohen, "The Shaping of Men's Minds;" "The State System, Schooling, and Cognitive and Motivational Patterns," in Social Forces and Schooling: An Anthropological and Sociological Perspective, ed. Nobuo K. Shimahara and Adam Scrupski (New York: David McKay, 1975), pp.103-140; Adam Scrupski; "The Social System of the School," *ibid*;, pp.141-186; Aaron V. Cicourel and John I. Kitsuse; The Educational Decision-Makers (Indianapolis:Bobbs-Merrill, 1963); Rosalie Cohen; "School Reorganization and Learning: An Approach to Assessing the Direction of Social Change," in Learning and Culture: Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society, ed. Solon T. Kiball and Jacquetta Hill-Burnett, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1972), pp.185-210; Tacott Parsons; "The School Class as a Social System: Some of Its Functions in American Society," in Socialization and Schools: Harvard Educational Review, Reprint Series no.1 (1968), pp.69-90.

13. Rosalie Cohen, "School Reorganization and Learning," pp.194-95.
14. Ibid, p.195.
15. Ibid, p
16. Ibid, p.196.
17. Paul Bohannan; Justice and Judgment among the Tiv (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), p.4; Ogbu, The Next Generation, p.16.
18. Ogbu, The Next Generation, p.5.
19. Ivar Berg; Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p.1-2
20. Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste.
21. Gerald D. Berreman, "Social Inequality: A Cross-Cultural Paradigm" (Unpublished Ms., 1977); Morton Fried; "On the Evolution of Social Stratification Culture and History: and the State," in/Essays in Honor of Paul Radin, ed. Stanley Diamond (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), pp.713-731. Gerald D. Berreman; "Race, Caste, and Other Invidious Distinctions in Social Stratification," Race,13 (1972): 384-414.
22. James S. Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity; Christopher Jencks; Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America (New York: Basic Books, 1972); Arthur R. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ?"; Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, eds., On Equality of Educational Opportunity.
23. John C. Leshlin, Gardiner Lindzey, and J.M.Spuhler, Race Differences in Intelligence (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1975), p.13.
24. Names S. Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity.
25. Walter Ackerman; "Reforming Israeli Education," in Israel: Social Structure and Change, ed. Michael Curtis and Mordecai Chertoff (New Brunswick, N.J.: Dutton, 1973), pp.397-408; Joseph Solomon Bentwich;Education in Israel

(London: Routledge and Kegan, 1965); Eva Rosenfeld; A Strategy for Prevention of Developmental Retardation Among Disadvantaged Israeli Preschoolers Henrietta Szold Institute, Research Report no.175 (Jerusalem, 1973).

26. Theodore Brameld; Japan: Culture, Education, and Change in Two Communities 1968 (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston); George A. DeVos and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, eds.; Japan's Invisible Race (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967); Nobuo K. Shimahara; Burakumin-A Japanese Minority and Education (The Hague: Morton, 1971).

27. Gerald D. Berreman; "Race, Caste, and Other Invidious Distinctions in Social Stratification," in *Race*, 13 (1972):398-399; "Social Inequality." See also Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste; idem, Racial Stratification and Education: The Case of Stockton, California New York: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1977).

28. Berreman, "Race, Caste, and Other Invidious Distinctions." idem, "Social Inequality," p.12. See also Max Weber, "Class, Status, and Party," in Max Weber, Essays in Sociology, ed. and trans. H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp.180-195.

29. Berreman, "Social Inequality," p.12.

30. Ibid, p. 23. See also Richard Sennett and Jonathan Cobb; The Hidden Injuries of Class (New York: Random House, 1972).

31. Berreman, "Social Inequality," p.23.

32. Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste, chap. 4.

33. Ogbu, The Next Generation, p.2. idem, "Castelike Minorities," in "Excluded Children: A Draft Report to the Carnegie Council on Children" (Unpublished Ms, New Haven, 1975); idem, "Rehabilitation and Social Structure: A Conservative Approach to Social Change" (Unpublished Ms, New Haven, 1975); idem, "Socialization

- of Competence"; *idem*, Minority Education and Caste.
34. Akin L. Mabogunje; Regional Mobility and Resource Development in West Africa (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1972); Tamotsu Shibutani and Kian M. Kwan; Ethnic Stratification: A Comparative Approach (New York: Macmillan, 1965).
35. J. McV. Hunt; The Challenge of Incompetence and Poverty: Papers on the Role Early Education (Urban: University of Illinois Press, 1969); Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ?" pp.76-79.
36. Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste. See also St. Clair Drake; "The Ghettoization of Negro Life," in ^{Negroes and Jobs, eds.} ~~in Louis A. Pomeroy~~, Joyce L. Kornbluh, and J.A. Miller (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1968), pp.112-128.
37. Robert E. Forman; Black Ghettoes, White Ghettoes, and Slums (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971).
38. Kenneth B. Clark; "Sex, Status, and Underemployment of the Negro Male," in Employment, Race, and Poverty: A Critical Study of the Disadvantaged Status of Negro Workers from 1865 to 1965, ed., Arthur M. Ross and Herbert Hill (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1967), pp. 138-148.
39. Carol Andreas; Sex and Caste in America (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971); Martha Blaxall and Barbara Reagan, eds., Women and the Work Place: Implications of Occupational Segregation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976); Cynthia Fuchs Epstein; Woman's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971); Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moore, eds.; Women In Sexist Society: Studies in Power and Powerlessness (New York: New American Library, 1971).
40. David M. Katzman; Before the Ghetto: Black Detroit in the Nineteenth Century (Urban: University of Illinois Press, 1973).
41. Ogbu, The Next Generation, pp.183-191.
42. Ogbu, Racial Stratification and Education.

43. Forman, Black Ghettoes; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: A Report, Vol.1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).
44. Bennett Harrison; Education, Training, and the Urban Ghetto (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), p.4; Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ?", pp.76-79; Charles C. Killingsworth; "Negroes in a Changing Labor Market," in Employment, Race, and Poverty, eds., Ross and Hill; pp.49-75; idem, "Jobs and Income for Negroes," in Race and the Social Sciences: A Survey from the Perspectives of Social Psychology, Education, Political Science, Economics, and Sociology, eds., Irwin Katz and Patricia Gurin (New York: Basic Books, 1969), pp.63-72.
45. H.P. Miller; Rich Man, Poor Man (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1971), p.18.
46. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ?"; Killingsworth, "Negroes in a Changing Labor Market."
47. Lorenzo Greene and Carter G. Woodson; The Negro Wage Earner (Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1930); Gunnar Myrdal; An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy (New York: Harper, 1944); Arthur M. Ross; "The Negro in the American Economy," in Ross and Hill, eds.; Employment, Race and Poverty, pp.3-48.
48. Horace Mann Bond; The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order (New York: Octagon Books, 1966); Henry Allen Bullock; A History of Negro Education in the South: From 1619 to the Present (New York: Praeger, 1970); Hortense Powdermaker; After Freedom: A Cultural Study in the Deep South (New York: Atheneum, 1968).
49. St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton; Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City (New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1970), vol.1; E. Franklin Frazier; The Negro in the United States (New York: Macmillan, 1957).

50. John U. Ogbu; "Ascribed Inequality and Social Policy" (Paper prepared for the Carnegie Council on Children, Meeting on Social Policy, Jackson, Miss., May, 1974); "Race, IQ, and Socioeconomic Inequality: A Critique of Arthur Jensen's Hypothesis" (Paper read at a Colloquium on Race and Intelligence, Anthropology Program, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, April, 1974).

51. Arvil V. Adams; Toward Fair Employment and the EEOC: A Study of Compliance Procedures Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Report (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972); Richard M. Burkey; Racial Discrimination and Public Policy in the United States (Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath, 1971); William B. Gould; Black Workers in White Unions: Job Discrimination in the United States (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977); Sheila Huff; "Credentialing by Tests or by Degrees: Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the Criggvs. Duke Power Company," Harvard Educational Review 44 (1974):246-269; Thomas F. Pettigrew, ed.; Racial Discrimination in the United States (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), pp.137-275; Arthur R. Ross; "Negro Employment in the South, Vol.3: State and Local Government (Washington,D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973).

52. Education Commission of the States; Adult Work Skills and Knowledge (Washington,D.C.:National Center for Educational Statistics, 1976).

53. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ?",pp.76-79; Killingsworth, "Negroes in a Changing Labor Market,"pp.49-75; idem, "Jobs and Income for Negroes," pp.63-72.

54. Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste, chap. 4.

55. Horace Mann Bond; The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order (New York: Octagon Books, 1966); Henry Allen Bullock;A History of Negro Education in the South; Truman M. Pierce et al.,White and Negro Schools in the South : An Analysis of Biracial Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1955).

56. Bond, Education of the Negro; Bullock, Negro Education in the South; Louis R. Harlan, Separate and Unequal: Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States, 1905-1915. (New York: Atheneum, 1968).
57. Bond, Education of the Negro⁴⁰⁴; Frazier, Negro in the United States, p.439. Myrdal, An American Dilemma, Vol.2, p.897.
58. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: A Report (Washington,D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), vol.1; Meyer Weiberg, Minority Students: A Research Appraisal (Washington,D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977); U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Report: Toward Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington,D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972).
59. Jonathan Kozol, Death at an Early Age (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966); Eleanor B. Leacock, Teaching and Learning in City Schools (New York: Basic Books, 1969); Mark R. Lohman, "The Practice of Inequality Within American Public Schools," in U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Part 20: Unequal School Practices (Washington,D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971), pp.10180-228; Alexander Moore, Realities of the Urban Classroom (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964); Ray C. Rist, "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education," in Harvard Educational Review, 40 (1970):411-451; Annie Stein, "Strategies for Failure," in Harvard Educational Review, 41 (1971):158-204.
60. Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste, chap.4; See also, for teacher attitudes and expectations, Nicholas Hobbs, The Future of Children (San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, 1975); Louis L. Knowles and Kenneth Prewitt, eds., Institutional Racism in America (Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969), chap.3:"The Subeducation of Black Children." U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Report: Toward Equality of Educational Opportunity. For misclassification,

labeling and tracking, See Hobbs, The Future of Children; Illinois Advisory Commission on Civil Rights, Bilingual/Bicultural Education: A Privilege or a Right? A Report (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974); Leonard A. Marascuilo and Maryellen McSweeney, "Tracking Minority Student Attitudes and Performance," in Richard R. Heiderich, Urban Education (Arlington, Va: College Readings, 1972), pp. 82-92; Richard Rothstein, "How Tracking Works," in Miriam Wasserman, ed., Demystifying School: Writings and Experiences (New York: Praeger, 1974), pp. 61-74; Children's Defense Fund, Children Out of School in America (Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project, 1974); Warren G. Findley, "How Ability Grouping Fails," Inequality in Education, no. 14 (July 1973): 38-40; Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Report: Toward Equality. For biased textbooks and curricula, see "Racism and Sexism and Children's Books" Carnegie Quarterly, 22, no. 4 (1974): 1-4; Knowles and Prewitt, Institutional Racism; Lohman, "The Practice of Inequality";

- 61. Ogbu, The Next Generation, pp. 164-169 (see n. 2, above).
- 62. Ogbu, Racial Stratification and Education (see Note 27, above).
- 63. Ogbu, The Next Generation; p. 44; Bernard Meer and Edward Freeman, "The Impact of Negro Neighbors on White Home Owners," Social Forces, 45 (1966): 11-19.
- 64. City of Stockton, "Workshop on Equality," Minutes of the City Council Committee to Study Employment Standards for City of Stockton, 1969; State of California, Fair Employment Practices Commission, "City of Stockton: Affirmative Action Survey," 1972; Ogbu, Racial Stratification and Education.
- 65/ Stockton Unified School District, "Annual Report," Washington Elementary School, 1967; "Annual Report," John Marshall Junior High School, 1969; "Annual Report," Edison Senior High School, 1968.
- 66. Stockton Unified School District, "Superintendent's Reactions and Recommendations to Black Unity Council," Board of Education Minutes, May 14, 1969, p. 4252;

- Ogbu, The Next Generation, pp.199-200.
67. Jane R. Mercer, Labeling the Mentally Retarded: Clinical and Social System Perspectives on Mental Retardation (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973);
68. Aaron V. Cicourel and John I. Kitsuse, Educational Decision-Makers (see n. 12, above).
69. David J. Armor, American School Counselor (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969), pp.44, 76-90.
70. Cicourel and Kitsuse, Educational Decision-Makers; David J. Armor, The American School Counselor (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969).
71. Ogbu, The Next Generation, p.198.
72. Ibid., p.200n.
73. Ibid, pp.201-202.
74. Gerald Weinstein and Mario D. Fantini, Toward Humanistic Education: A Curriculum of Affect (New York: Praeger, 1970); Elizabeth Leonie Simpson, Humanistic Education: An Interpretation. A Report to the Ford Foundation (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1976); Harvard Educational Review, 42, no.3 (1972), Special Issue.
75. See Various articles in the special issue of Anthropology and Education Quarterly, on Multicultural Education in Theory and Practice, vol.7, 1976.
76. Ibid.
77. Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste, chap. 4, for a review.
78. Ray Marshall, "Industrialization and Race Relations in the Southern United States," in Negroes and Jobs, ed. Louis A. Ferman, Joyce L. Kornblu, and J.A. Miller (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1968), pp.28-52.
79. Nancy Frazier and Myra Sadker, Sexism in School and Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1973); Janice Pottker and Andrew Fishel, eds., Sex Bias in the

- Schools: The Research Evidence (Cranbury, N.J.: Associated University Press, 1977).
80. Michael B. Kane, Minorities in Textbooks: A Study of Their Treatment in Social Studies Texts (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970); Knowle and Prewitt, Institutional Racism, chap.3; U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Report: Toward Equality.
81. Stockton Unified School District, "Mrs. Fields Asked About Policy on Teachers that Demean Negro Children," Minutes of Board of Education, Feb. 27, 1968, pp.4211-4212 ; "New Courses Approved for 1969-70," Minutes of Board of Education, March 25, 1969, pp.4497.
82. J.McV. Hunt, The Challenge of Incompetence and Poverty: Papers on the Role of Early Education (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969); Ira J. Gordon, Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968); Sar A. Levitan and Karen Cleary Alderman, Child Care and ABC's Too (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975); Irwin Katz, "Socialization of Academic Achievement in Minority Group Children, in Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, ed. D. Levine (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), pp.132-191
83. Miriam L. Goldberg, "Socio-Psychological Issues in the Education of the Disadvantaged," in Urban Education in the 1970's, ed. Harry Passow (New York: Teachers College Press, 1971), pp.51-93; Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ?" (see n.5, above); Katz, "Socialization of Achievement."
84. See Ralph Mason Dreger, "Intellectual Functioning," in Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States, Kent S. Miller and Ralph M. Dreger, eds., (New York: Seminar Press, 1973), pp.185-231; Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ?"; Bernard C. Rosen, "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome," in Achievement in American Society, Bernard C. Rosen, H.J. Crockett, and C.Z. Nunn, eds., (Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman, 1969), pp.131-153; Harry J. Crockett and Jerome L. Schulman, Achievement Among Minority Americans: A Conference Report (Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman, 1973); See various articles in a special issue of Journal of Social Issues, vol.25, no.3, 1969, on Negro Americans.

85. Several of the works in k83 refer to this problem; see esp. Goldberg, "Socio-Psychological Issues," and Katz, "Socialization of Achievement."
86. Benjamin Bloom, Allison Davis, and Robert Hess, Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965); Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Is Early Intervention Effective?" in The Family As Educator, ed. Hope Jensen Leichter (New York: Teachers College Press, 1973), pp.105-129; Martin Dutsch, "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Processes: Some Social and Developmental Considerations," in Education in Depressed Areas, ed. A. Harry Passow (New York: Teachers College Press, 1963), pp.163-79; Katz, "Socialization of Achievement;" Fred Powledge, To Change a Child: A Report on the Institute for Developmental Studies (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967); Julian C. Stanley, ed., Compensatory Education for Children, Ages 2 to 8: Recent Studies of Educational Intervention (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).
87. Drake and Cayton, Black Metropolis, vol.2, p.743 (see n.49, above).
88. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ?" p.13.
89. Leacock, Teaching and Learning (see n.59, above)
90. John W. Berry, Human Ecology and Cognitive Style: Comparative Studies in Cultural and Psychological Adaptation (New York: Halstead Press, 1976); John W. Berry and P.R. Dasen, eds., Culture and Cognition: Readings in Cross-Cultural Psychology (London: Methuen, 1974); Patricia Marks Greenfield, "On Culture and Conservation," in Studies in Cognitive Growth, ed. Jerome S. Bruner, Rose R. Oliver, and Patricia M. Greenfield (New York: John Wiley, 1966), pp.225-256. Sidney Irvine, "The African Contributions to the New Thinking About Intelligence," in Cultural Adaptations Within Modern Africa, ed. S.H. Irvine and J.T. Sanders (New York: Teachers College Press, 1972), pp.97-101; Robert A. Levine, "Cross-Cultural Study in Child Psychology," in Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, ed., P. Mussen, 3rd ed (New York: John Wiley, 1970), vol.2, pp.559-612; P.E. Vernon, Intelligence and Cultural Environment (London: Methuen, 1969).
91. Inkeles, see n.9, above.

92. Kohn, "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships" (see n.9, above).
93. Scrupski, "Social System of the School" (see n.12, above).
94. Vernon, Intelligence and Cultural Environment, p.10.
95. Mary Jo Bane, "Economic Justice: Controversies and Policies," in The "Inequality" Controversy: Schooling and Distributive Justice, ed. Donald M. Levine and Mary Jo Bane (New York: Basic Books, 1975); p.287; Joan Castello and Ellice Payton, "The Socialization of Young Children's Learning Styles," (Unpublished Ms, New Haven, 1973); Allison Clarke-Stewart, Child Development in the Family: A Report to the Carnegie Council on Children (1977).
96. Bullock, Negro Education in the South, (see n.48, above); Drake and Cayton Black Metropolis; Leonard Goodwin, Do the Poor Want to Work: A Social Psychological Study of Work Orientations (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1972); Joan Huber Rytina, William H. Form, and John Pease, "Income and Stratification Ideology: Beliefs About the American Opportunity Structure," American Journal of Sociology, 75 (1970):703-717; Harry C. Triandis, ed., Variations in Black and White Perceptions of the Social Environment (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976).
97. Allison Davis, Burleigh B. Gardner, and Mary R. Gardner, Deep South: A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965); John Dollard, Caste and Class in a Southern Town, 3rd ed. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1957); Ogbu, The Next Generation; Powdermaker, After Freedom.
98. Drake and Cayton, Black Metropolis, p.743; National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Report (1968), p.61; Paul H. Norgren and Samuel E. Hill, Toward Fair Employment (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964); Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste (see note 10, above); Powdermaker, After Freedom, pp.107, 112, and 300 (see n.48, above). George Scherer, "Effectiveness of Equal Opportunity Legislation," in The Negro Employment Opportunity, ed. Herbert N. Northrup and

Richard L. Rowan (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965), p.85.

99. Drake and Cayton, Black Metropolis, pp. 255, 287; Carter, Mexican Americans in School, pp. 136-37;

100. Frazier, The Negro in the United States (see n.49, above); Ogbu, The Next Generation.

101. Lacey, Hightown Grammar (see n.3, above).

102. Cicourel and Kitsuse, Educational Decision-Makers.

103. Kenneth Polk and Walter E. Schafer, eds., Schools and Delinquency (Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

104. Robert Bendiner, The Politics of Schools: A Crisis in Self-Government (New York: Harper and Row, 1969); Marshall O. Donley, Jr., Power to the Teacher: How America's Teachers Became Militant (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 19).

105. Alan Little and George Smith, Strategies of Compensation: A Review of Educational Projects for The Disadvantaged in the United States, (Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1971), pp.70-72.

106. Shelly Kessler and Susan Husinger, "Day Care Policy: A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Council on Children," (Unpublished Ms, New Haven, 1975); Levitan and Alderman, Child Care and ABC's (see n.82, above).

107. Kessler and Husinger, Day Care Policy, p.11.

108. Levitan and Alderman, Child Care and ABC's, chap.2.

109. Ibid.

110. Ibid., pp.76-80.

111. Bloom, Davis, and Hess, Compensatory Education (see n.86, above); Deutsch, "The Disadvantaged Child," (see n.86, above); Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste, chap.3.

112. Levitan and Alderman, Child Care and ABC's; Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste; Stanley, Compensatory Education; Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Compensatory Education: Defining the Issues," in Disadvantaged Child, ed. Jerome Hellmuth, Compensatory Education: A National Debate (New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1970), vol. 3, pp. 24-25.

113. Levitan and Alderman, Child Care and ABC's.

114. Ogbu, The Next Generation.

115. Ross and Hill, eds., Employment, Race, and Poverty (see n. 38, above).
American

116. For/Indians, see B. Berry, The Education of the American Indian--Final Report Project No. 7-0813, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Washington, D.C., 1969); William Brophy and Sophie D.A. Aberle, The Indian: America's Unfinished Business (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966); M. Coombs et al., The Indian Child Goes to School (Lawrence, Kansas: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Haskell Institute, 1958); Estelle Fuchs and Robert J. H. Havighurst, To Live on This Earth: American Indian Education (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1973); National Advisory Council on Indian Education, First Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974); E.A. Parmee, Formal Education and Cultural Change (Tucson: Arizona University Press, 1973).

For Mexican Americans, see Carter, Mexican Americans in School; Leo Grebler, J.W. Moore, and Ralph Guzman, eds., The Mexican American People, the Nation's Second Largest Minority (New York: Free Press, 1969); U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Toward Quality Education for Mexican-Americans, Report VI, Mexican-American Education Study (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974);

For Puerto Ricans, see Francesco Cordasco, "The Puerto Rican Child in the American School," in The Puerto Rican Community and Its Children on the Mainland, ed. Francesco Cordasco and Eugene Bucchiono (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow

- press, 1972); pp.341-348; Patricia Cayo Sexton, "Schools: Broken Ladder to Success," *ibid.*, p.342; New York State Department of Education, Bilingual Education (Albany, N.Y.: Regents of the University of the State of New York, 1972).
117. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 7, no.1 (1976); Illinois Advisory Commission on Civil Rights, Bilingual/Bicultural Education (see no.60, above).
118. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, vol.7 (no.1), 1976.
119. Jesse B. Sears *et al.*, Stockton School Survey (Stockton, California: Board of Education, 1938); Stockton Unified School District, "Community Survey: In-School Youth," (Unpublished Ms.: Research Department, 1948).
120. E.J.B. Rose, Colour and Citizenship: A Report on British Race Relations (London: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1969); United Kingdom, Parliamentary Select Committee on Immigration and Race Relations, Session 1972-73, Education, vol.1, Report (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1973).
121. David P. Ausubel, Maori Youth: A Psychoethnological Study of Cultural Deprivation (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961); Bruce Biggs, "The Maori Language, Past and Present," in The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties, ed. Erik Schwimmer (New York: Humanities Press, 1968), pp.65-84; New Zealand Government, The Hunn Report: Report on Department of Maori Affairs (Wellington: Government Printer, 1961).
122. For American Indians, see Jack D. Forbes, ed., The Indian in America's Past (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964); Vine Deloria, Jr, Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence (New York: Dell, 1974); Edward H. Spicer, Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533-1960 (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1962); Murray L. Wax and Robert W. Buchanan, eds., Solving "the Indian Problems": The White Man's Burdensome Business (New York: New York Times

Book, 1975);

For the Mexican Americans, see Rodolfo Acuna, Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1972); Jack D. Forbes, "Mexican Americans," in Mexican-Americans in the United States: A Reader, ed. John H. Burma (New York: Schenkman, 1970), pp. Clark S. Knowlton, "The Neglected Chapters in Mexican-American History," in Mexican Americans Tomorrow: Educational and Economic Perspectives, ed. Gus Tyler (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1975), pp.19-59; Fred H. Schmidt, Spanish Surnamed American Employment in the Southwest: A Study Prepared for the Colorado Civil Rights Commission (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970).

For Puerto Ricans, see Carey McWilliams, Brothers Under the Skin (Boston: Little, Brown, 1974); Michael Meyerson, "Puerto Rico: Our Backyard Colony," in Puerto Rican Community, ed. Cordasco and Bucchioni, pp.68-75; Candido Olivares, "What Are the Educational Needs of Puerto Ricans Who Come to New York?" Ibid., pp.246-251.

123. Julian Nava, "Cultural Backgrounds and Barriers That Affect Learning by Spanish-Speaking Children," in Mexican-Americans in the United States, ed. Burma, pp.125-134; Clarence Senior, "Puerto Ricans on the Mainland," in Puerto Rican Community, ed. Cordasco and Bucchiono, pp.182-195; U.S. Department of Interior, Statistics Concerning Indian Education (Washington, D.C.: Office of Indian Education Program, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1974).

124. Philip Blair, Job Discrimination and Education: An Investment Analysis (New York: Praeger, 1971); Idem., "Job Discrimination and Education," in Schooling in a Corporate Society: The Political Economy of Education in America, ed. Martin Carnoy (New York: David McKay, 1972), pp.80-99.

125. Blair, Job Discrimination: Investment Analysis, pp.82-85.

126. Blair, "Job Discrimination," pp. 82-85.
127. U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Part 4, Mexican American Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970); idem, Part 21, Equal Educational Opportunity for Puerto Rican Children; National Advisory Council on Indian Education, First Annual Report;
128. Carter, Mexican Americans in School, pp. 18, 20-22, 136-137.
129. John S. Bryde, The Sioux Indian Student: A Study of Scholastic Failure and Personality Conflict (Vermillion, S.Dak.: Dakota Press, 1970).
130. Fuchs and Havighurst, To Live on This Earth, pp. 128 ff.
131. Carter, Mexican Americans in School, p. 137.
132. Ibid., pp. 20-21; From Author's interviews with local Aspira Officials in Chicago, Dec. 1974.
133. Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste,^{esp.} /chap. 13, gives a comparative review of these stratification systems.
134. Ibid.; see also chaps. 8, 9, 10, and 11 for individual subordinate minority groups.
135. Ibid.
136. Rosalie Cohen, "School Reorganization and Learning" (see n. 12, above).
137. & See Christopher Jencks et al., Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America (New York: Basic Books, 1972); Donald M. Levine and Mary Jo Bane eds., The "Inequality" Controversy : Schooling And Distributive Justice (New York: Basic Books, 1975).